

MACDONALD

Cannegieter's Manuscripts of Avianus

Classics

A. M.

1913

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY

1913
M14





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

<http://archive.org/details/cannegietersmanu00macd>

CANNEGIETER'S MANUSCRIPTS OF AVIANUS

BY

JANET MALCOLM MACDONALD

A. B. Morningside College, 1910

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

IN CLASSICS

IN

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1913

1913
M14

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

2 June 1913

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Janet Malcolm Macdonald

ENTITLED *Carnegie's Manuscripts of Arionus*

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF *Master of Arts*

W. A. Oldfather

In Charge of Major Work

H. J. Barton

Head of Department

Recommendation concurred in:

Arthur Stanley Pease
H. V. Canter

Committee

on

Final Examination

247412



CANNEGIETER'S MANUSCRIPTS OF AVIANUS.

The date to which the forty two fables of Avianus must be assigned has long been the subject of controversy among philologists. The most able discussion of the question is by Otto Crusius under the article "Avianus" in Pauly Wissowa's Real-Encyclopädie der klass. Altertumswiss. Vol. II, 2 (1896) Sp. 2373 ff. In this article he proves conclusively that the period of activity of Avianus was at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries of the Christian era.¹ Avianus was not an author in the sense of a creative artist, for his work was merely the versification of fables already translated into Latin prose by Titianus from the Greek verse of Babrius who, in his turn, had found his material ready to hand in a prose collection of animal folk-tales conventionally assigned to Aesop.

During the Middle Ages these Fables of Avianus experienced a fate similar to the rest of classical literature, remaining in comparative obscurity until the dawn of the Renaissance brought renewed interest in the culture of antiquity. Since the invention of printing many re-prints and a few so-called critical editions of Avianus have appeared, of these latter the most important prior to the work of Ellis and Baehrens being the one by Hendrik Cannegieter.² This philologist and historian was born at Steinfurt

1. This date was settled first by the masterly dissertation of Otto Unrein: De Aviani aetate, Jena, 1875, whose results have been accepted by all competent authorities. For further treatment of details compare Hervieux: Les Fabulistes Latins, Vol. III, Étude sur les fables latines d'Avianus et de ses anciens imitateurs. Paris 1894, pp. 3-48, and Robinson Ellis: The Fables of Avianus, Oxford, 1887, Prolegomena pp. XI-XXVIII.

2. See the biographical article in Larousse: Grand Dictionnaire Universel.

in Westphalia in 1691 († 1770). He held the positions of rector of the gymnasium at Arnheim and historian of the state of Gueldre. His Latin publications are mainly upon questions relative to Roman antiquities, his best known work being the edition of Avianus which was published in 1731 at Leyden (or Amsterdam).¹ As the product of immaturity the work is pedantic in style and overloaded with grammatical, syntactical, rhetorical and literary notes cast into confusing juxtaposition with manuscript readings.

These variant readings which Cannegieter cites in great numbers constitute the principal value of his edition today, as he was the only one of the early editors of Avianus who consistently quoted readings from any large number of manuscripts, and, in his preface, he has given a list of twenty codices (besides several old editions) whose readings he regularly cites. Since the time of Cannegieter most of the manuscripts to which he referred have passed from one place to another until the designation of owner and location, which sufficed for description in his day, is in no single instance adequate to identify beyond question a manuscript now existing with one which he had employed.

It is the purpose, therefore, of this study to discover the relation of Cannegieter's manuscripts of Avianus to such manuscripts of that fable writer as are in existence at the present time; to identify wherever possible the very manuscript used, or, at least, to determine the general class to which each belonged. There are several necessary steps in the process of this

1. Flavii Aviani Fabulae, cum commentariis selectis Albini scholiastae veteris, notisque integris Isaaci Nicolae Neveleti et Casparis Barthii: quibus animadversiones suas adjecit Henricus Cannegieter. Accedit ejusdem dissertatio de aetate et stilo Flavii Aviani. Leyden (or Amsterdam) 1731. pp. 324 (exclusive of indices).

investigation; first — an examination of the external evidence by comparing the titles which Cannegieter gives his manuscripts or any other descriptive details he may mention, with the corresponding designations of the manuscripts existing to-day. For instance, Cannegieter describes one of his manuscripts, which he calls B, as a very old codex belonging to the library of the Benedictine monastery at Saint Germain des Prés. Comparing these data with the facts known concerning present day manuscripts, there is found one very old manuscript at Paris which was formerly in the library of the Benedictine monastery at Saint Germain des Prés. Therefore, we are justified in conjecturing that this manuscript is the same as the one Cannegieter quotes. In about half of the manuscripts under consideration a clue is given by some similar details in their history.

The second step is the examination of the internal evidence by comparison of the readings which Cannegieter quotes for each manuscript with the readings of the present day manuscript which by hypothesis based on external evidence is assumed to be the one Cannegieter is quoting. This step in the investigation is made possible by Dr. W. A. Oldfather's list of over eighty of these manuscripts, the greater part of which are already collated. The comparisons fall naturally into three groups — (a) Agreements, where Cannegieter's citations agree with the readings of the present day manuscript; (b) Disagreements, where there is a discrepancy between Cannegieter's citation and the reading of the existing manuscript; (c) Failures to cite, where Cannegieter's silence leads to the inference that the reading of a manuscript was the same as that of his accepted text and yet that text differs from the

reading of the manuscript which, by hypothesis, is the one Cannegieter is supposed to be quoting. For convenience of reference this last group will be referred to as "non-citatur".

The third step is the verification of readings, so that any possible error may come to light. For instance, the readings noted down for each manuscript are compared again with Cannegieter (for often his Latin notes are very obscure), then again with Dr. Oldfather's collation of the present day manuscript with which it is supposed to be identical, and finally with the actual photographs of each manuscript.

The fourth step is the elaboration of important points for the purpose of securing certainty in proof. Out of the agreements must be culled those which are really significant. If, when Cannegieter quotes a singular spelling or rare word, the only manuscript which agrees with such a reading is that one which external evidence has pointed out as probably the very manuscript to which Cannegieter was referring, this fact may be considered to furnish proof of their identity. A large number of such significant agreements makes a strong case in favor of this conclusion.

In the case of disagreements it is necessary to see if any explanation can be offered which will account adequately for them. Sometimes this is comparatively easy; for example, "adgreditur" — "aggreditur", is simply an unimportant difference in spelling. Or, better yet in 3, 5, Cannegieter quotes Voss. 3. as reading "feri", yet what is undoubtedly the same manuscript, Voss. L. O. 89 (Leyden), has "fera", but in the manuscript itself it is difficult to decide which it is ^{same} by close examination of other cases of the same letters in that manuscript. This ^{quotation} rather constitutes an argument

for than against identity, since no other manuscript has any similar reading. Some disagreements, of course, cannot be explained except on the supposition that either Cannegieter or some one of his collators was in error.

In this connection it is important to note that Cannegieter did not collate a single one of these manuscripts himself, but accepted the collations made by his friends among the classical scholars of the day, or else the collations prepared by others which his friends secured for him. All of these men could not possibly have used any one standard text as their criterion. These circumstances afford a two-fold chance for error — first, on the part of the collators of the manuscripts, and second, on the part of Cannegieter in taking over their work. In some cases there are still greater chances for error, for instance, Cannegieter states that he obtained his citations of one manuscript from Henricus Dreux who copied for him excerpts from the collations of Arnold Drakenborch; in such transmission there must inevitably be a considerable percentage of error. For four manuscripts we still have the same collations which were used by Cannegieter, namely A, N, P, collated by Pulmann, and of a Palatine manuscript collated by Nevelet. Cannegieter states plainly that he cites readings from these on the authority of Pulmann and Nevelet; yet the number of discrepancies between Cannegieter's quotations and Pulmann's and Nevelet's actual readings is so large that it affords indubitable proof of a large number of errors on the part of Cannegieter (see discussion of manuscripts A, N, P, and Pal. below). From this demonstration of the existence of a considerable percentage of error in printed collations, it must be conceded that it is

reasonable to expect rather numerous mistakes in his reports upon other manuscripts.

A collateral line of proof is found in the existence of Epimythia, or morals, added at the end of various fables. If Epimythia are actually found where Cannegieter says they appear, a strong case is made out for the identity of the two manuscripts compared. Especially is this true, if the existence in both manuscripts of certain peculiar readings is likewise attested. Furthermore, such details ⁱⁿ form as the occurrence of the Epimythium on the margin or in a later handwriting, add considerable force to the evidence.

As a preliminary step to the detailed consideration of each manuscript it will be necessary to add for reference the list of manuscripts and their abbreviations which Cannegieter gives in his Preface (4).

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 8-11 | A. Liber Canon ^o icorum Novim ^o agensium Collegii Catherinae, quem consuluit Pulmannus. |
| 14-16 | B. Codex ms. Benedictinorum, S. Germani ad Prata |
| 17-18 | C. 1. Colbertinus primus |
| 19-21 | 2. " secundus |
| 21-23 | 3. " tertius |
| 23-24 | Col. 1. Coloniensis primus |
| 24-27 | 2. " secundus |
| 34-38 | 3. " tertius |
| 38-44 | Cort. 1. Cortianus primus |
| 44-45 | 2. " secundus |
| 45-46 | 3. " tertius |
| 46-48 | L = Codex ms. Langermanni |
| 48-50 | M = Codex ms. Mediceus |
| 50-52 | N = Liber Canon ^o icorum Novim ^o agensium Collegii Catherinae, a Pulmannus excerptus. |
| 52-53 | P. Codex. ms. Pulmanni |
| 53-54 | Palat. Codex ms. Palatinus, quo usus est Neveletus |
| 54-55 | Voss. 1. Vossianus codex ms. primus |
| 55-56 | 2. " " secundus |
| 56-57 | 3. " " tertius |
| 57-58 | 4. " " quartus |

(4) As the Praefatio is unpagged and comparatively short a general reference to it here and elsewhere will doubtless suffice.

These manuscripts fall into three general classes as regards the results obtained. First, those which by external and internal evidence may be identified with manuscripts existing to-day. In this group belong. B, L, Col. 1, 2, 3. C, 1, 2, 3, and Voss. 1, 2, 3. Second, those which by internal evidence alone may be so identified. To this class belong the three Cortiani and P. The last group includes those manuscripts for which close scrutiny has failed to discover the identical manuscript among those now known and collated and where one must, therefore, be content merely to point out the general class to which each belongs. Here must be placed Voss. 4, the Palatinus of Nevelet, and A and N of Pulmann.

B

The most convenient manuscript with which to begin the detailed examination of evidence is B, because of the important external evidence upon which a hypothetical identification may be based, its age, and its importance. Cannegieter in his preface describes B as a manuscript of seven or eight hundred years (*Hic credebatur septingentorum vel octingentorum annorum aetatem praeferre. Cannegieter, Praefatio.*) i.e. of the ninth century, and says it belonged to the library of the Benedictine Monastery of Saint Germain des Prés. Now no. 13026 in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* (5) at Paris is clearly a ninth century manuscript and belonged formerly to this same library of Saint Germain des Prés, so that a hypothetical identification of the two is obvious.

Now the internal evidence establishes the correctness of the hypothesis. So numerous and significant are the agreements in readings for the Epistle and the first ten fables that it is quite superfluous to carry the comparison any further. In the following passages no. 32 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as B: Praef. 4. *dubitandi*; 13 *munitus*; 15 *Flaaus*; 15 *brachius*; 1, 11 *Maligne*; 2, 6 line omitted; 2, 15 *sublatis*; 3, 2 *relesit*; 3, 5 *hac*; 4, 6 *nudat*; 7, 7 *probitas* omitted; 9, 10 *in-fingens*; 9, 13 *rigni*; 10, 7 *dilecto*; 10, 12 line omitted. In the following passages 32 with two or three other representatives of the same family are the only surviving manuscripts which have the

(5) Paris. Bibl. Nat. 13026, formerly at Saint Ger. des Prés. S. IX (XI). Membr. For convenience of reference I shall henceforth refer to this manuscript as "32", its number in Dr. Oldfather's list. Other Mss. will be referred to in the same fashion. For their regular signatures see the comparative table at the end of this paper.

same readings as B: Praef. 5 quomodo (59); 23 ablectes (60); 1, 13 nam quia praeda rogas (42); 2, 1 pinnatis (42, 59); 4, 1 pladusque (42, 59); 5, 5 defuncti (42, 59); 5, 15 corpose (59); 6, 10 perdidit (42, 59); 7, 12 dispiciebat (42, 59, 61); 9, 1 motibus (42); 9, 17 secura (42, 59). Other agreements less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: Praef. 19 parte; 20 ad XLII; 20 ego; 1, 1 famis; 2, 2 volucrem constituisset; 4, 10 quod; 5, 4 solis; 5, 12 pavidas ("B.l."- obvious misprint); 5, 18 qui quondam; 6, 5 quo; 6, 5 possit; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 8 mol(1)am; 8, 9 innexis; 7, 11 praemia; 7, 11 ferre; 8, 14 adgreditur; 8, 19 ostendatur; 10, 5 praestant.

The following disagreements should be listed (the first reading is always that of B and the second that of no. 32): Praef. 18. Phaedris-phoedus, no such reading as Phaedris appears in any of the manuscripts; 1, 1 deflentem parvum-defluentem parvum, from the silence of the collator Cannegieter may have argued by inference that B was like the many others which had "deflentem parvum"; 2, 13 quieti- lacking- quietis, but quietis appears in smaller hand and may therefore have been disregarded as an addition by a later hand; 7, 8 molam- mollam, unimportant discrepancy in spelling; 8, 9 eisdem- et solum, the manuscript is indistinct and -l- had been added later, therefore, at first sight the reading appears to be "eisdem". As will readily be seen these disagreements are neither numerous nor significant enough to offset the very striking agreements.

In the following instances Cannegieter fails to list a reading that varies from his own text (the first reading is Cannegieter's text and so by inference ex silentio that of B, and the second that of no. 32): 4, 2 full line- line omitted, collator may

have failed to note this fact; 4, 14 deposita- siposita; 6, 9, vulpes pecudum- val pecudum; 8, 2 fabula nostra- nostra fabula; 9, 18-21- full lines- lines omitted, collator may have failed to note this fact; 10, 11 positos referens- referens positos. The following instances of such omissions to cite are less important: Praef. 6. occurrit- occurrunt; 13 Apollinis- Apolinis; 16, communium- comnium; 21 Latinitate- lanitate; 21 edidi- dedi; 21 elegisum- elegisum; 24 totumque vivendi- ms. illegible; 25 agnoscas- agnuscas; 28 proferatur- proferratur; 1, 12 vix- vixit; 1, 14 iurgia- lurgia; 2, 5 indignans- indignum; 2, 5 sedula- sedulea; 2, 9 quaerit- querit; 2, 11 sublimis- sublimes; 2, 12 licuisse- lucuisse; 2, 13 atque ait- nam dedit. Cannegieter merely states what he thinks the reading ought to be ; 3, 1 quum- cum; 3, 11 quom- cum; 4, 7 impulsus- impulsis; 4, 16 nullum- nullam; 5, 2 ferre- fere; 5, 7 aptavit que suis- aptavit suis; 5, 14 vinclis- vinculis; 5, 17 ignotos- ignotus; 6, 3 prata- pra; 6, 8 curret- curret; 8, 1 contentum- contendum; 8, 5 auras- aruas; 8, 14 dammage- damgeme; 8, 12 magnae- magne; 8, 12 auras- aures; 9, 4 posset- possit; 9, 6 medium- mediam; 9, 7 viridum repidum- viridi trepidum; 9, 10 relisus- reliset; 10, 1 reliquare- reliquasse. The argument ex silentio can seldom be used against positive evidence, and perhaps never in matters of manuscript collation.

The positive disagreements and omissions in the citation of variant readings cannot be considered large when one has in mind the indirect way in which Cannegieter got his information of the readings of B. It appears that Arnold Drakenborch collated the manuscript, and that Henri Dreux copied his collation for Cannegieter's use, thus greatly increasing the possibilities of

error (Descripsit haec excerpta ex libro Cl. Drakenborch Vir Eruditus, Henricus Dreux qui Scholae Hieronymianae Trajecti ad Rhenum operam navat- Cannegieter, Praefatio.)

Finally it might be noted that B has no epimythia, the same being true of 32.

L

In close connection with B must be considered L, for Cannegieter says that it rarely differs from B (Rarus etiam inter Codicem Langermanni et Benedictorum dissensus. Cannegieter, Praefatio.) The designation Codex Langermanni has a suspicious look, as no one by that name is known. Now B was at the monastery of Saint Germain des Prés and striking similarity in sound ^{and appearance} between ^(in the form "Sangermanensis") "Saint Germain" and "Langermanni" brings up the question if it would be possible for these to be one and the same manuscript. The fact that Cannegieter used the collations of different men for B and L- of Nicholas Heinze (copied by Francis Burmann) for L and of Arnold Drakenborch (copied by Henri Dreux) for B- makes it probable that there is here some error in reading or copying Heinze's notation ^{coupled with a slight mispronunciation} ~~and mispronouncing slightly~~, and that in consequence Cannegieter makes two manuscripts out of the imperfectly reported collations of a single one. Therefore, a hypothetical identification of L with B and 32 appears plausible.

The internal evidence seems sufficient to establish the correctness of the hypothesis. So numerous and significant are the agreements in readings for the Epistle and the first ten fables that it is quite superfluous to carry the comparison any further. In the following passages L agrees with B, and 32 is the only surviving manuscript which has this same reading: Praef. 13 munitus;

1, 11 maligne; 2, 15 sublati; 3, 2 releat; 3, 5 hac; 4, 6 nudat; 9, 10 infingens; 10, 7 dilecto. In addition for 4, 14 siposita 32 is the only manuscript which has such reading, yet for B, Cannegieter, by failure to cite, leaves the impression that B has the same reading as his accepted text, namely, "deposita". This must be a mere case of oversight on the part of Cannegieter or of his collator. In the following passages L agrees with B, and 32 with two or three representatives of the same family are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same readings: Praef. 5 quomodo (59); 1, 13 nam quia praeda rogas (42); 2, 1 pinnatis (42, 59); 4, 1 pladusque (42, 59); 5, 5 defuncti (42, 59); 7, 12 dispiciebat (42, 59, 61); 9, 1 motibus (42); 9, 17 secura (42, 59). L agrees with B in the following instances, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts: Praef 20 ego; 5, 4 solis; 6, 5 quo; 6, 5 possit; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 8 mollam; 7, 9 innexis; 7, 11 praemia; 7, 11 ferre; 8, 14 adgreditur; 7, 17 ostendatur; 10, 5 praestant.

The following disagreements should be listed (first is given the reading quoted for L and after it the reading of 32): 1, 1 deflentem parvum- defluentem parvum, this disagreement likewise appears for B. Possibly the mistake arose because Cannegieter inferred from the silence of the collator that the reading was the same as that of the other old manuscripts which have defl^entem parvum; 2, 6 perficeret que- proficeritque Cannegieter's quotations for this passage very rarely agree with the various manuscripts cited (This disagreement does not appear in B); 2, 13 quieti omitted- quietis, but quietis appears in smaller hand and may therefore have been disregarded as a mere interpolation. This disagreement likewise appears in B.

The passages in which Cannegieter fails to list a reading that varies from his own text have already been listed under B.

The positive disagreements and omissions in the citation of variant readings cannot be considered large when one has in mind the indirect way in which Cannegieter got his readings of L. It appears that Nicholas Heinze collated the manuscript and Peter Burmann took these collations and handed them over to his nephew, Francis Burmann to copy for Cannegieter's use. (Deinde ex schedis Heinsianis sex antiquorum Codicum Lectiones Vir Celeberrimus Petrus Burmannus depromsit, easque in usum nostrum describendas tradidit Fratrìs sui Filio Francisco. Cannegieter, Praefatio.)

Finally it might be noted that L has no epimythia, the same being true of 32.

Note. Dr. Oldfather, to secure a little more evidence has ^{results are} carried the comparison of B and L on through fables 11-20. Therefore as follows: "There are in fables 11-20, twenty examples of readings peculiar to B and L (13, 7 (ter); 15, 5 (bis), 6 (bis), 13; 16, 2, 6, 7, 18; 17, 7, 12; 18, 1, 13 (bis), 14; 19, 11; 20, 7), the reading in 18, 14 being especially significant, where it is reported (correctly) that invadat has been changed to invadit by the second hand. There are furthermore nineteen instances in which B and L agree in company with other manuscripts (11, 5, 10, 15; 13, 9, 13/14; 14, 15-19; 16, 11, 14; 17, 7, 19/20; 18, 4, 16; 19, 4, 10, 13, 15/16; 20, 11, 16, 17/18). Only once (15, 3) is a disagreement reported, and here the reading of 32 namque intum arias, which Cannegieter correctly gives for B, looks very much like nam quinttim arias, which he quotes for L, and Heinze may have actually so reported it. Even if the collation was correct, such is the general similarity in the method of writing these letters that Francis Burmann may have made the mistake in reading Heinze's handwriting, or Cannegieter in reading Burmann's. There is no room for reasonable doubt as to the identity of B and L."

C.1

In his Preface Cannegieter states that C.1 was no. 1512 in Colbert's library (Tres extant in Bibliotheca Colbertina, in qua his numeris designantur 1512, 5254, 6260. Nos illos littera C notatos his numeris eodem ordine destinximus 1, 2, 3.) Now no. 8093 in the Bibliotheque National at Paris (6) was formerly no. 1512 in Colbert's library, so that a hypothetical identification of the two is natural.

Internal evidence establishes the correctness of this hypothesis. So numerous and significant are the agreements in readings for the Epistle and the first twenty-two fables that it is quite superfluous to carry the comparison any farther. In the following passages no. 29 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as C.1.: 4, 5 hac potius litem praefigere
(7)
caussa (M.2.); 8, 2 ne; 8, 4 qua; 10, 3 conspectus venit; 9, 3
-b-(M.2)
dedisset (M.1); 17, 4 adesse. In the following passages 29 and two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as C.1.: 4, 10 quod (27, 30, 60, 61); 5, 4 solis (27, 59, 60, 61); 6, 9 vulpis (59, 60); 17, 7 vulnere (2, 62. Other agreements, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: 1, 1 deflentem parvum; 1, 13 nam quae praeda rogas; 2, 5 indignum; 2, 6 perficeret que; 2, 13 quieti; 3, 3 praecedere; 5, 18 qui quondam; 7, 3 quondam, 7, 9 innexis; 7, 11 praemia; 8, 9 et solum; 9, 21 maxime; 12, 5 aras; 12, 9 prodis; 14, 2 qui; 15, 2 continuasse; 16, 11 respondens;

(6) Paris. Bibl. Nat. 8093. S. IX (X), membr. For convenience of reference I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "29", its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

(7) M.2 manus secunda; M.1 manus prima.

16, 13 rabidos; 17, 8 praestrivxit; 17, 11 dum quis; 18, 4 invadit; 18, 15 tum; 18, 16 cupit; 18, 18 ut; 19, 4 quod; 19, 9 ast; 20, 16 futura; 21, 8 extremis; 22, 3 numina; 22, 5 his quoque se; 22, 7 praestandi.

The following disagreements should be listed: 4, 11 crescere- increscere, Cannegieter quotes six manuscripts but only two out of the six tally with his citation; 7, 14 adgreditur- aggreditur, no manuscript of Avianus is consistent in observing assimilation of the final consonant of a preposition in composition, 10, 5 praestant- prestant, e and ae are almost interchangeable in Mss. of this period. As will readily be seen these disagreements are neither numerous nor significant enough to offset the very striking agreements. They are all three probably due to mistaken inferences from an incomplete collation.

In the following instances Cannegieter fails to list a reading that varies from his own text: Praef. 6 obcurrit- occurrit; 9 utroque- introque utroque; 10 Graeca- greca; 1, 5 nimiae- nimie; 1, 8 conjux- conjunx; 2, 9 quaerit- querit; 2, 12 haec- hec; 2, 13 haec- hec; 2, 13 atque ait- nam dedit; Cannegieter merely states that "atque ait" is what he thought the reading ought to be; 3, 5 haec- hec; 5, 13 deprendit- deprehendit; 6, 5 quod- quo; 6, 12 caeruleus- ceruleus; 7, 5 caudae- caude; 7, 9 aera- era; 7, 12 despiciebat- despitiebat; 7, 15 quae- que; 9, 1 quid mirum positos referens- quid mirum referens positos; 9, 17 quum- cum.

The positive disagreements and omissions in the citation of variant readings cannot be considered large when one has in mind the indirect way in which Cannegieter got his information of the readings of C.l. It appears that Arnold Drakenborch collated

the manuscript and that Henri Dreux copied this collation for Cannegieter's use, thus greatly increasing the possibilities of error (*Descripta haec Excerpta ex libro Cl. Drakenborchi Vir Eruditus Henricus Dreux. Cannegieter, Praefatio*).

Finally, it might be noted that C.1. has no epimythia, the same being true of 29.

C.2.

In his preface Cannegieter states that C.2 was no. 5254 in Colbert's library (*Tres extant in Bibliotheca Colbertina, in qua his numeris designantur 1512, 5254, 6260. Nos illos littera Cnotatos his numeris eodem ordine destinximus 1, 2, 3*). Now no. 5570 in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* at Paris (8) was formerly no. 5254 in Colbert's library, so that a hypothetical identification of the two is natural.

Internal evidence again bears^{out} the assumption of identity. So numerous and significant are the agreements in readings for the Epistle and the first twenty-two fables that it seems unnecessary to carry the comparison any further. In the following passages no. 27 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as C.2.: 5, 18 eras; 16, 8 adstet; 16, 13 rapidos; 16, 14 tutis. In the following passages 27 and two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as C.2.: 4, 10 quod (29, 30, 60, 61); 5, 4, solis (29, 56, 60, 61); 7, 14 adgreditur (53); 11, 4 facta (17, 23, 81); 11, 5 motu (73); 16, 1 radicibus (25, 66); 19, 9 dent (73); 19, 11 illa (18, 22). Other

(8). Paris Bibl. Nat. 5570, S. IX, X. Membr. For convenience of reference I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "27", its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

agreements, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts, may be listed as follows: 1, 1 defluentem parvum; 1, 13 nam quae praeda rogas; 2, 5 indignum; 2, 6 perficeret que; 3, 6 ne velis; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 9 innexis; 7, 11 praemia; 8, 9 et solum; 9, 21 maxime; 10, 5 praestant; 11, 5 solido; 12, 5 aras; 12, 9 prodis; 14, 2 qui; 15, 2 continuasse; 16, 11 respondens; 17, 7 viscera; 17, 8 praestrinxit; 17, 11 dum quis; 18, 14 invadit; 18, 16 cupiet; 19, 4 quod; 19, 13 succidat; 20, 16 futura; 22, 3 numina; 22, 5 his quoque se; 22, 7 praestandi.

The following disagreements should be listed: 2, 13 quieti- (The reading here is quite illegible in the photograph of the manuscript, so that this instance cannot properly be listed as a real disagreement); 3, 3 praecedere- procedere, Cannegieter quotes a long list of manuscripts on this reading and it may be error on his part; 3, 8 pronos- pro^ono^oso, this is half the truth, therefore it has little weight as a disagreement; 4, 11 crescere- increocere, out of six manuscripts which Cannegieter quotes for this passage only two tally with his reading; 11, 10 brevis- brevi, unimportant; 17, 2 pavidas- rabidas, Cannegieter quotes a large number of manuscripts here, several of them wrongly. As will readily be seen these disagreements are neither numerous nor significant enough to offset the striking agreements.

In the following instances Cannegieter failed to cite a reading that varies from his own text: Praef. 10 Graeca- Greca; 16 vitae- vite; 17 Graecis- Grecis; 21 elegis sum^uelegisum; 1, 5 membra- menbra; 1, 8 conjux- conjunx; 2, 1 locuta- loquuta; 2, 9 sidera- sydera; 2, 13 atque ait- nam dedit, no manuscript authority, merely Cannegieter's idea of what the reading ought to be;

31. quum- cum; 3, 5 haec- hec; 3, 12 vitiosa- viciosa; 4, 6 decutienda- decucienda; 4, 9 duplicem lateri- lateri duplicem; 4, 14 resedit- sederit; 5, 3 ne- nec; 5, 7 membris- menbris; 6, 5 quodquo; 6, 7 nec- nam; 6, 11 haec- hec; 6, 11 membris- menbris; 7, 4 rictibus- ratibus; 7, 17 ostentatur- ostendatur; 9, 13 membra- membra; 10, 4 coepit- cepit; 10, 10 admota- ammota; 10, 11

The positive disagreements and omissions cannot be considered large when one has in mind the indirect way in which Cannegieter got his information of the readings of C.2, the same in fact as that in which he learned about B and C.1, see above.

Finally, it might be noted that C.2 has no epimythia, the same being true of 27.

C.3

In his preface Cannegieter states that C.3 was no. 6260 in Colbert's library (Tres extant in Bibliotheca Colbertina, in qua his numeris designantur 1512, 5254, 6260. Nos illos littera C. notatos his numeris eodem ordine destinximus 1, 2, 3.) Now no. 8302 in the Bibliotheque National at Paris (8) was formerly no. 6260 in Colbert's library. Furthermore, Cannegieter states that only twenty-seven fables appear in C.3. (Ut autem post fabulam XXVII Colbertinus tertius desinit, Praefatio.) a fact which is true likewise of 30. Hypothetical identification of the two is therefore natural.

The internal evidence establishes the correctness of the

(8) Paris Bibl. Nat. 8302, S. XIV, membr. For convenience of reference I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "30", its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

hypothesis. So numerous and significant are the agreements in readings for the first twenty-two fables that it seems unnecessary to carry the comparison further. In the following passages no. 30 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as C.3: 2, 15 timescit; 5, 12 torquebat; 10, 11 mirum est; 14, 13 moneat; 16, 8 prostet; 19, 4 meriti; 19, 9 quia; 20, 6 sed quanta; 21, 6 continuasse; 21, 9 ille enim. In the following passages 30 and two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as C.3.: 1, 13 namque rogas praedam (34, 51, 54); 3, 10 certius (54); 48 detulit (8, 9, 35); 7, 10 cavenda (14, 24); 9, 5 herbas (54); 7, 6 magnus (9, 15, 77); 14, 6 gerit (34); 16, 15 paulatim surgentes (6, 12, 16, 66, 77); 20, 6 lucra (27, 38); 21, 12 saevam manum (20). Other agreements less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: 1, 9 defers; 2, 2 destituisset; 2, 13 quieti; 3, 3 praecedere; 3, 8 prono; 4, 6 discutienda; 4, 11 crescere; 5, 5 gaetuli cum forte; 5, 12 pavidas; 5, 18 ast; 5, 18 qui quondam; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 8 rapido; 7, 11 praemia; 8, 9 et solum; 9, 21 multa; 12, 5 aras; 12, 9 podis; 12, 12 primum; 13, 5 hunc; 13, 5 rumpere; 15, 2 continuasse; 15, 11 innumeras; 17, 4 abesse; 18, 12 collectum; 18, 14 invadit; 19, 7 puppibus in patulis; 20, 10 rursus; 20, 10 redibo; 20, 16 futura; 21, 8 proficietur; 22, 5 his quoque se.

The following disagreements should be listed: 7, 9 innexis-inexis, an unimportant difference in spelling; 7, 14 adgreditur-aggreditur, no manuscript of Avianus is consistent in observing assimilation of the final consonant of a preposition in composition; 13, 7 locutus est-locutus, insignificant omission of "est";

13, 10 qui sequitur que- insequitur que, a serious disagreement not easily accounted^{for} except as an error on the part of Cannegieter or his authorities ; 15, 1 Traiciam- Treioiam, of the several quotations which Cannegieter gives for this passage, few tally with the manuscript readings; 19, 6 ad astra- in astra, unimportant. As will readily be seen these disagreements are neither numerous nor significant enough to offset the striking agreements.

In the following instances out of the first ten fables Cannegieter fails to list a reading that varies from his own text: 1, 2 rabido- rapido; 1, 5 nimiae- nimie; 1, 5 membra- menbra; 2, 4 pretium- precium; 2, 11 sublimis- sublimes; 2, 12 haec- hic; 2, 13 exosae- exose; 2, 16 poenas- penas; 3, 1 quum- cum; 3, 2 hispida- hypsida; 3, 6 neu velis ire- ne velis ire; 4, 1 sidera- sydera; 4, 7 aether- esther; 4, 8 imber- ymber; 4, 9 duplicem lateri- lateri duplicem; 4, 14 humi- (h)umis; 4, 15 Titan- Tytan; 5, 7 membris- menbris; 5, 8 caput- capud; 6, 7 Paeonio- Peonio; 6, 11 aegrotis- egrotis; 6, 12 caeruleus- ceruleus; 7, 5 submittens- summittens; 7, 5 caudae- caude; 8, 4 eadem minuat quae dedit- eadem quae minuat dedit; 8, 11 adridens- arridens; 8, 14 damna- dampna; 9, 1 artum- arctum; 9, 8 onus- honus; 9, 11 cupiens- cupiens omitted; 9, 17 quum- cum; 10, 5 huius- au; 10, 6 caput- capud; 10, 10 calliditate- caliditate; 10, 11 positos referens- referens positos; 10, 12 aequaevae- equeve.

The positive disagreements cannot be considered numerous when one recalls that Cannegieter got his knowledge of this Ms. in the same indirect way as he learned of B and C.1 (see above). The failure to report on so many variant readings is doubtless due due to Drakenborch himself, who seems to have paid little attention

to a late, bad and incomplete Ms.

Strong collateral proof is afforded by the epimythia. For the following fables no. 30 has epimythia just where Cannegieter quotes them as existing in C.3.: Fables 11; present in margin 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 24 and 26. In the following instances no. 30 has certain specific readings which Cannegieter quotes for C.3.: 11, 16 *comparis est melior* changed to *compar erit melior*; 13, 13 *potes*; 13, 14 *tuo*; 14, 16 *ne sint alterius*; 17, 19 *cuncta licet soleant animalia cuncta (bruta in 20) timere*; 19, 16 *fata*; 24, 17/18 *ne credos aliquem, docet ista parabola forte, Exemplo vacuo credere velle tibi*; 26, 13 *credere*; 26, 14 *quae monuit*.

For the epimythia there is but one disagreement i.e., 17, 19 *cuncta- bruta*, but since the rest of the two verse citation tallies exactly this disagreement of a single word is much minimized, and besides the form in which Cannegieter quotes the verse makes such arrant nonsense that is incredible that it should ever have stood in any manuscript. This single disagreement cannot in any sense offset the striking agreements in the citation of epimythia.

Col.1.

In his preface Cannegieter states that Col.1 was a Cologne manuscript Nicholas Heinze's collation of which was copied by Francis Burmann for his use in preparing this edition. (*Deinde ex schedis Heinsianis sex antiquorum Codicum Lectiones Vir Celeberrimus Petrus Burmannus depromsit, easque in usum nostrum describendas tradidit Fratri sui Filio Francisco. Tres inter hos Colonien- ses esse adnotaret Nicolaus Heinsius.*) Noting then that the Colonienses 1, 2, 3 rarely differ from the corresponding Colbertini

he advances the theory that they are identical, the Colonienses having been transferred from the city of Cologne to the Library of Colbert. (Colonienses hi tres in paucis discrepant a Colbertinis eodem numero recensitis; et si nonnulla in his aut oculis, aut manuum festinationi dederis, iidem videri possunt, atque ex Coloniensi urbe in Bibliothecam Colbertinam migrasse.) It is very probable, then, that Heinze collated these manuscripts at Cologne and that later in Paris they were collated by Drakenborch under a different name.

The correctness of this hypothesis is substantiated by a careful examination of the reported readings for the two Mss. So numerous and significant are the arguments for the Epistle and the first twenty-two fables that it seems needless to carry the comparison further. In the following passages Col.1 agrees with C.1. and 29 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading: 4, 5 hac potius litem prae figere caussa, (in M); 8, 2 ne; 8, 4 qua; 9, 3 dedisset (M.1.); 10, 3 conspectus venit; 17, 4 -b-(M.2) adessee. In the following passages Col. 1 agrees with C.1 and 29 with two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading: 5, 4 solis (27, 59, 60); 6, 9 vulpis (59, 60); 17, 7 vulnere (4, 62). Other agreements, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: 1, 1 deflentem parvum; 2, 13 quieti; 3, 3 praecedere; 5, 12 pavidas; 5, 18 qui quondam; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 9 innexis, 7, 11 praemia; 8, 9 et solum; 9, 21 maxime; 12, 5 aras; 12, 9 prodixit; 14, 2 qui; 16, 11 respondens; 16, 13 rabidos; 17, 11 dum quis; 18, 14 invadit; 18, 16 cupiet; 18, 18 ut; 19, 4 quod; 20, 16

futura; 21, 8 extremis; 22, 3 numina; 22, 5 his quoque se; 22, 7 praestaudi.

In only one case for the first twenty-two fables does Cannegieter note any disagreement between C.1 and Col.1, i.e. in 17, 8 he quotes praestrinxit for C.1. and prostrinxit for Col.1. This single disagreement cannot be considered of great importance in view of the striking agreements.

Like C.1, no epimythia are quoted for Col.1 and as stated before manuscript 29 has none.

Col.2.

For Col.2 Cannegieter states that it was likewise a Cologne manuscript of which the collation was prepared by Nicholas Heinze and later copied by Francis Burmann for his use in preparing this edition (see above on Col.1.) As stated for Col.1 Cannegieter, on account of the similarity in readings between the Colbertini and Colonienses, ventured the guess that they were the same manuscripts, the change in name resulting from the transfer of the manuscripts from the city of Cologne to Colbert's library.

A careful comparison of the citations of C.2 and Col.2 substantiates this theory. The agreements for the Epistle and the first twenty-two fables are so numerous and significant that it seems unnecessary to carry the comparison farther. In the following passages Col.2 agrees with C.2 and 27 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading: 5, 18 solis; 16, 8 adstet;
-b-(M.2)
16, 13 rapidos; 16, 14 tutis. In the following passages Col.2 agrees with C.2 while 27 and one or two others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading: 4, 10 quod (29, 30, 60, 61); 5, 4 solis (29, 56, 60, 61); 7, 14 adgreditur (53);

8, 2 fabula nostra (16, 28, 68); 11, 4 facta (17, 73, 81); 11, 5 motu (73); 16, 1 radicibus (25, 66); 19, 9 dent (73); 19, 11 illa (18, 22). Other agreements, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: 1, 1 deflentem parvum; 2, 6 perficeretque; 3, 6 ne velis; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 9 in-nexis; 7, 11 praemia; 8, 9 et solum; 9, 21 maxime; 11, 5 solido; 12, 5 aras; 12, 9 prodis; 14, 2 qui; 15, 2 continuasse; 16, 11 respondens; 17, 7 viscera; 17, 11 dum quis; 18, 14 invadit; 19, 4 quod; 19, 13 succidat; 20, 16 futura; 22, 3 numina; 22, 5 his quoque se; 22, 7 praestandi.

In only one case does Cannegieter note any disagreement between C.2 and Col.2. in 17, 8 he quotes praestrinxit for C.2 and prostrinxit for Col.2. This single disagreement cannot be considered of great importance in view of the striking agreements.

Furthermore, Col.2 like C-2 has no epimythia, which, as we have seen is likewise true of 27.

Col.3

In addition to stating his theory of the identity of the Colonienses 1, 2, 3 with the Colbertini bearing the corresponding numbers, as noted on Col.1, Cannegieter specifically connects Col. 3 with C.3 by mentioning the fact that each of these contains only twenty-seven fables. (Post fabulam XXVII. Colbertinus tertius, ita et Coloniensis tertius, desinit. Praefatio.) From this statement a hypothetical identification of the two obviously follows.

A careful comparison of the citations of Col.3 and C.3 substantiates the correctness of this theory. So numerous and significant are the agreements in readings in the first twenty-two fables, that it has not seemed necessary to carry the comparison

further. In the following passages Col.3 agrees with C.3 and 30 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading: 2, 15 timescit; 5, 12 torquebat; 10, 11 mirum est; 14, 13 moneat; 16, 8 prostet; 19, 9 quia; 20, 6 sed quanta; 21, 6 continuasse. In 4, 12 cresceret, 30 is the only manuscript which agrees with this citation for Col.3, yet Cannegieter by his silence bids us to infer that the reading of C.3 was that of his accepted text, namely, surgeret; but the argument ex silentio can seldom be used against positive evidence and perhaps never in matters of manuscript collation. In the following passages Col.3 agrees with C.3 while 30 and two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading: 1, 13 namque rogas praedam (34, 51, 54); 3, 10 certius (54); 4, 8 detulit (8, 9, 35); 7, 10 canenda (14, 24); 8, 5 herbas (54); 8, 6 magnis (9, 15, 77); 14, 6 gerit (34); 16, 15 paulatim surgentes (6, 12, 16, 66, 77); 20, 6 lucra (38); 21, 12 saevam manum (20). Other cases of agreement, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: 1, 9 defers; 2, 2 destituisset; 2, 13 quieti; 3, 3 praecedere; 3, 8 prono; 4, 6 discutienda; 4, 11 crescere; 4, 14 resedit; 5, 5 gaetuli cum forte; 5, 18 qui quondam; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 11 praemia; 8, 9 et solum; 9, 10 reliset; 9, 21 multa; 12, 5 aras; 12, 5 prodixit; 12, 12 primum; 13, 5 hunc; 13, 5 rumpere; 15, 2 continuasse; 15, 11 innumeras; 17, 4 abesse; 18, 12 collectum; 18, 14 invadit; 19, 7 puppibus in patulis; 19, 9 ast; 20, 10 rursus; 20, 10 redibo; 20, 16 futura; 21, 8 proficietur; 22, 5 his quoque se.

The following disagreements should be listed: For the Epistle of Avianus Cannegieter quotes several readings for Col.3 (4 dubitandi; 15 Flaaus; 19 parte; 20 de his; 23 sollicitudines)

but this Epistle is lacking in manuscript 30. It is noticeable that no quotations from the Epistle are made for C.3; it seems probable, then, that the Epistle was lost between the collation by Heinze (while the manuscript was yet at Cologne) and that of Drakenborch when it was in Paris. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that Avianus appears at the beginning of the manuscript where a sheet might easily have been torn off and, furthermore, the superscription, "Fabulae Aviani", is in a much later hand.

Cannegieter never cites any disagreement of readings between C.3 and Col.3 in the first twenty-two fables. In one case, 2, 6 he quotes Col.3 as having the reading *perficeret que* and makes no mention of C.3,^{et} this failure to cite cannot offer any proof against the identity of the manuscript for it may be mere oversight on the part of Cannegieter or more easily yet a mistake of the printer.

Strong collateral evidence is afforded by the presence of epimythia. Wherever Cannegieter quotes an epimythium from C.3, the same epimythium with precisely the same readings appear also in Col.3. In the following fables Col.3 agrees with Col.1 (and both of them agree with 30) in the existence of epimythia: 11, 12, present in margin; 14, 17, 19, 24, 26. In the following specific readings Col.3 agrees with C.3 (and 30): 11: 15 *comparis est melior compar erit melior*; 14, 16 *ni sint alterius*; 17, 19 *cuncta licet soleant animalia cuncta (bruta in 30) timere*; 19, 16 *fata*; 24, 17 *ne credas aliquem docet ista parabola forte exemplo vacuo credere velle tibi*; 26, 13 *credere*; 26, 14 *quae monuit*. For 26, 13 *cuiusdam*, 30 is the only manuscript which agrees with this citation of Col.3, yet Cannegieter by his silence leads us to infer that the

reading of C.3 was the same as that of his accepted text, namely cuiusquam; but in this passage as in others the argument ex silentio can have but small weight against positive agreements.

In no case does Cannegieter note any disagreement of the readings for the epimythia between C.3 and Col.3, a fact which strengthens the argument for their identity.

Voss.1

In his preface Cannegieter states that Voss.1 was a Vossian manuscript one of "sex antiquorum Codicum", Nicholas Heinze's collations of which Francis Burmann copied. (See above on Col.1). From the fact that this is included among the old manuscripts and that Cannegieter mentions it first we might not unnaturally infer that the oldest Vossian manuscript now in Leyden is the same one. This manuscript is Voss. L. Q. 86 in the Bibliotheek der Rijk's Universiteit at Leyden (9).

The internal evidence bears out this theory. So numerous and significant are the agreements for the Epistle and the first ten fables that it seems unnecessary to carry the comparison farther. In the following passages 59 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as Voss.1: Praef 5 quonam modo titulorum titulo nominis; 14 per exemplum; 17 Graecus (but only in M.2); 21 dedi (M.1) e didi (M.2); 26 facimus; 2, 11 auras, 4, 7 impulsis venti. In the following passages 59 and one or two others (usually belonging to the same family i.e. 32, 42, 60, 61), are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as Voss.1:

(9) Univ. Bibl. Voss. L. Q. 86 (Leyden) S. IX membr. For convenience of quotation I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "59", its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

Praef. 6 occurrunt (32); 12 ducent esse novis (62); 1, 14 ferens (60); 1, 6 famis (32, 42, 60); 21 pinnatis (32, 42); 2, 3 arenas (63, 68, 69); 4, 10 summotis (32); 4, 14 seposita (62); 5, 5 defuncti (32, 42, 84); 7, 2 supplicione (32, 42, 77); 7, 12 dispiciebat (32, 42, 62, 66); 7, 14 adgreditur (27, 32, 42, 53, 60, 73); 9, 4 possit (32, 38, 42). Other agreements, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: Praef. 23 sollicitudines; 2, 5 indignum; 4, 8 depulit; 5, 4 solis; 5, 12 pavidas; 5, 17 fallas; 5, 18 qui quondam; 6, 5 quo; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 8 rapido, 7, 9 innexis; 7, 11 praemia; ferre; 8, 9 et solum; 8, 14 perpetuom.

The following disagreements should be listed: Praef. 20 usque ad quadraginta- ad quadraginta, Cannegieter quotes a long list of manuscripts here, several of them wrongly; 1, 2 rapido-rabido, unimportant; 1, 13 namquae praeda rogas- namque praeda rogas; there is considerable confusion of que and quae in this particular manuscript and in this passage the original reading has been erased and written over by the second hand. It seems likely that Cannegieter has misunderstood the report of the collation; 2, 2 volucris- volucre, unimportant; 2, 10 feri>fera- fero>feri, quite a significant disagreement; it may be a mistake of Heinze's or Cannegieter's misreading of Heinze's writing; 3, 1 dum- cum, unimportant; 4, 14 resedit- sederet, this significant disagreement may likewise be an error of Cannegieter or his authority; 7, 2 dignos-dignas, unimportant; 8, 2 fabula nostra- nostra fabula, a mere change in word order which might easily have been overlooked; 9, 3 mali- malum, unimportant.

In the following instances Cannegieter fails to list a

reading that varies from his own text: Praef. Dictatur Theodosi opime quomodo; this reading of the first hand has probably not been mentioned because the second hand has corrected it to the form in which it appears in Cannegieter's text; 7, urbane- urbanae; 18 Phaedrus- Phoedus; 23 oblectes- oblectas; ^{-es(M.2)} 7, 7 nequem probitas- nequem gravitas; 8, 18 damna- dampna; 9, 21 multa- magna; 10, 1 religare- religasse.

It will readily be seen that the disagreements and omissions do not offer evidence enough to offset the agreements; especially when it is remembered that Cannegieter secured his knowledge of this manuscript in a very indirect way from Francis Burmann's copy of Heinze's collation of that manuscript.

Since 59 has no epimythia, the fact that Cannegieter quotes none for Voss.1 is not without significance.

Voss.2

In his preface Cannegieter says that Voss.2 was transferred from the private library of Vossius to the library at Leyden and that it was listed on page 386 of the manuscript catalogue of that library published in 1716. (In Bibliothecam Leydensen transierunt illi manu exarati Codices ex Bibliotheca Vossiana: quare Vossiani secundi et tertii nomen iis imposuimus. Ille in Catalogo Bibliothecae Lugduno Batavae, qui anno 1716, vulgatus est recensetur pag. 386 Col.2. Hic pag. 390 Col.2.) Voss. L. O. 15 now in the University Library at Leyden (10) is known to have been a Vossian manuscript and it ^{is} ~~was~~ listed on page 386 of the library catalogue

(10) Univ. Bibl. Voss. L. O. 15 (Leyden; formerly at Abbey St. Martin at Limoges) S, X/ XI. membr. For convenience of quotation I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "60", its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

published in the year 1716.

Although there can be no reasonable doubt that the manuscripts are identical, for purposes of completeness in proof, the internal evidence was also considered. As was expected it establishes the correctness of the identification. So numerous and significant are the agreements for the Epistle and the first ten fables that it seems needless to carry the comparison further. In the following passages 60 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as Voss.2: Praef. 29 libellis; 21 elegico versu; 2, 1 pennatus quondam testudo sicone locuta est, this peculiar reading is very significant; 2, 12 collicuisse; 3, 5 nec; 4, 7 venas; 14 12 igne omitted; 5, 4 deperit; 7, 4 de patulis; 8, 13 merito omitted; 9, 7 facile; 10, 3 at campum; 10 12 aequae. In the following passages 60 and two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as Voss.2: 1, 4 ferens (59); 2, 10 ungui fero (2-, 32, 42, 59); 5, 5 exubias (32, 42, 59); 7, 14 adgreditur (32, 42, 53, 59); 8, 3 non est et (42, 59). Other agreements less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: Praef. 4 optime Theodosi; 2, 6 perficeretque; 2, 11 tunc; 2, 14 peti; 5, 4 solis; 5, 12 pavidas; 5, 17 fallas; 5, 18 qui quondam; 6, 5 quo; 6, 9 vulpis; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 8 molam; 7, 9 innexis; 7, 11 ferre; 8, 9 et solum; 8, 10 abiectum; 10, 5 praestant; 10, 9 milibus.

The following disagreements should be listed; Praef. 7 doceat- deceat, may be a mistake on the part of Cannegieter or of one of his authorities, 20 ego- ergo, these are often confused; 3, 4 semonuisse- praemonuisse, it is difficult to determine which is the reading of the manuscript save by very close examination,

Therefore, this very discrepancy adds strength to the theory of identity; 3, 5 transverso- transversa, unimportant; 3, 5 hoc- nec, the difficulty of determining which is the actual reading of the manuscript is an argument for rather than against identity; 3, 8 oro- oso > proso (M.2), M.1 does look like oro; 4, 7 venas- ventis, so nearly alike that the disagreement helps rather than hinders the proof of identity; 4, 10 quo- quod, also so nearly alike in the manuscript as really to prove the manuscripts the same; 5, 5 abracto- abstracto, 6, 2 linteis- luteis, a careless reader might mistake for linteis; 6, 5 possit- posset, in this handwriting so nearly alike that the error if anything tends to prove the manuscripts the same; 6, 7 haec- nec, the reading very like haec at first sight.

The instances where Canegieter fails to list a reading that varies from his text, are so few in number for this manuscript that it proves that Arntzen was very careful in his collation. These instances are as follows: Praef. 4 optime Theodosi- optimi Theodosi optime, the ^{et} repetition of optime must ^{have been disregarded by Canegieter as,} ~~be~~ a mere mistake of the copyist; 3, 9 et male mercatis dum quaerit- et male mercatis quaerit dum; 5, 10 pigraque- nigrique; 10, 1 religare- religasse.

The positive disagreements and omissions in the citations of variant readings are neither numerous nor significant enough to offset the striking agreements. The collations were made by Otto Arntzen from manuscripts loaned by Peter Burmann. (Duos etiam manu exaratos Codices Cl. Burmannus suppeditavit nobis ex Leydensi Bibliotheca, cui publice praefectus est. Hos libros tres diligenter cum vulgatis contendit Doctissimus Vir Otto Arntzenius. Canegieter, Praefatio).

Finally, it might be noted that Cannegieter quotes no epimythia for Voss.2, nor does 60 have such verses.

Voss.3

In his preface Cannegieter says that Voss.3 was transferred from the private library of Vossius to the library at Leyden and that it is listed on page 390 of the catalogue of that library published in 1716 (See above under Voss.2.). Voss. L. O. 89 now in the University Library, at Leyden (11) is known to have been in the possession of Vossius and it is listed in the Leyden library catalogue of the year 1716 on page 390. Therefore it is easy to infer that the manuscripts are identical.

The internal evidence bears out this assumption. So numerous and significant are the agreements in readings for the Epistle and the first ten fables that it seems unnecessary to carry the comparison further. In the following passages 61 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as Voss.3: Praef. -di-(M.2) 12 exopum; 17 augmenta; 18 cohortavit; 1, 16 credit; 2, 1 testudo omitted; 2, 2 custinuisset; this appears only in M.2 yet 61 is the only manuscript which has such a reading at all; 4, 14 -t (M.2) sedere; 5, 12 pavidas (M.2); 5, 16 miserum omitted in M.1 and (M.2) added in M.2; 7, 10 videnda; 9, 8 trepidum; 9, 13 timore, calore, timore is in M.1, then crossed out and calore added in M.2; 9, 18 fugaxait; 9, 19 trepido quidnam. In the following passages 61 and two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as Voss.3: 1, 6 subtulit (66); 4, 13 lapsa (M.2) (51); 5, 14 verberibus (que) (63); 7, 12 dispiciebat (32, 42, 59,

(11) Voss. L. O. 89, (Leyden) S. XII. membr. For convenience of reference I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "61", its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

66); 8, 1 contemptum (26, 33); 8, 13 meritis (9, 81); 9, 10 examen (8, 30, 35); 10, 11 quod mirum (51, 63, 77). Other agreements, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: Praef. 23 sollicitudinem; 1, 8 conjux; 2, 4 bacha; 2, 5 indignum; 3, 8 prono; 5, 4 solis; 6, 5 quo; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 11 praemia; 7, 17 ostendatur; 8, 9 et solum; 8, 10 abiectum; 8, 11 irridens; 9, 7 comprehendens.

The following disagreements should be listed; 1, 13 quae praeda roga- que praeda rogas, there is much confusion throughout both manuscripts and editions as to the reading of this passage and Cannegieter may not have understood the reading as reported; 2, 10 ferae- fero, may be error of Cannegieter or one of his authorities; 6, 9 vulpis- vulpes, unimportant; 7, 9 innexis, inxis, unimportant; 7, 13 moveris- moneris, very difficult to decide which is the reading of 61; 9, 11 feri- fera, so much alike that it is impossible to decide which is the reading save by a close examination of the same letters throughout the manuscript, therefore, this strengthens rather than weakens the proof of identity since no other manuscript has any such reading.

In the following instances Cannegieter fails to list a reading that varies from his own text: Praef. 4, mihi- michi; 9, quum- cum; 4, 6 decutienda- detucienda; 14, 8 nimias- *n̄rmias 4, 10 trahit- trait; 5, 2 alterius- alerius; 5, 6 ora- hora; 5, 8 caput- capud; 5, 18 mihi- michi; 6, 12 ora- hora; 7, 2 suppliciove- supplicio ut supplicio vel; 8, 2 fabula nostra- nostra fabula; 8, 12 onus- honus; 8, 14 damna- dapna; 10, 1 religare- religasse; 10, 3 nitido- nitidum.

These disagreements and omissions ^{do} cannot seem numerous nor

important enough to offset the striking agreements when one considers that Cannegieter secured his information concerning Voss.³ in the same indirect fashion ^{as was} noted for Voss.².

The fact that 61 has no epimythia and Cannegieter quotes none for Voss.³ is important confirmation of the argument.

Cort.1

For the manuscripts examined thus far, there has been external evidence upon which to base an hypothesis as to the identity of each. But for the three Cortiani there is no such evidence. Cannegieter merely says he secured his knowledge of these three manuscripts from Prof. Gottlieb Cortius of Leipsic who collated them for him. (*Reliqui sunt tres Codices, quos consuluit Gottlieb Cortius Vir Clarissimus, Professor Lipsiensis, et quae in his variant, nobis impertiit. Ea commemorata videbis hoc modo Cort.1, 2, 3.*) There are however, no manuscripts specifically known to-day as having been used or owned by Gottlieb Cortius. Therefore, the identification of Cortianus 1 (if it be in existence now) must be based upon internal evidence. For this purpose a record was made of all the manuscripts in Dr. Oldfather's list with which each reading of Cort.1, for the first twenty-two fables, agreed. In this comparison one manuscript stood out prominently on account of its agreement on peculiar readings. This was 288 Gud. belonging to the Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel (12).

On the conjecture that this was the identical manuscript which Cannegieter quoted as Cort.1, the comparison was continued

(12) Guelferbytanus 288. Gud. S. XIV. membr. For convenience of reference I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "57", its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

throughout the forty- two fables. So numerous and significant were the agreements that there could be no reasonable doubt of identity, despite the lack of external evidence. In the following passages 57 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as Cort.1: 2, 16 magna labore peti (m.1) dum meliora cupit (m.2); 5, 5 fortasse; 5, 12 lustra boves ...* feras (m.2); 5, 13 depressit (as far as the manuscript in photograph is legible); 9, 18 fugans; 16, 13 subtus tumidus; 17, 13 rauco; 17, 17 direpta; 18, 11 dictis insistere pravis; 14, 8 expulit; 20, 1 deprendre saeta; 23, 4 dispositurus; 23, 14 aut nocuisse; 26, 5 et sithici; 26, 6 loca; 26, 8 intimulare; 28, 11 versam; 29, 3 aversa; 30, 13 his justam verbis; 34, 5 erectos; 38, 7 aufers; 39, 13 ardens (habet tamen Cort.1 sed prave)- ardens addens, this is the only manuscript which shows any trace of such reading and Cannegieter's reference in itself proves carelessness (unless a misprint) for no number is quoted for the Cortianus quoted; 39, 15 nec audes; 40, 10 concilium; 41, 10 jussit abire; 42, 8 immeritam propria. In the following passages 57 and two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as Cort.1: 2, 10 decidit (2, 15, 81); 3, 8 pedes (2, 18, 77, 81); 4, 5 praefingere (5, 15, 77); 5, 12 turbavit (14, 18); 9, 14 vigor (6, 18); 14, 8 (21, 68); 15, 7 ereptae (61, 69); 17, 11 pande quis (21); 18, 3 evelleret (81); 18, 12 collatum (14, 34, 68); 20, 3 deduxit (54, 55); 22, 2 terram (3, 17, 81); 23, 14 aut (12, 18, 26, 55); 25, 6 delituisse (5, 16, 25, 59, 81); 29, 8 stupet (25, 51); 35, 1 fama quod est (1, 12, 21); 42, 3 variarunt (3, 21, 55). Other agreements less significant because found in a good many manuscripts may be listed as follows: 1, 8 sentit; 1, 9 defers; 1, 13 namque

rogas praedam; 2, 2 destituisset; 3, 1 dum; 3, 3 cupiens facili;
 3, 6 ne velis; 3, 7 contempta; 4, 11 crescere; 4, 14 recedit; 5, 4
 remeare; 5, 9 circumstetit; 5, 12 pavidas; 5, 14 que omitted; 6, 2
 tantum luteis; 7, 9 innexis; 7, 11 praemia; 8, 12 fabula nostra;
 8, 11 irridens; 9, 10 resedit; 9, 21 multa; 9, 21 maxime; 9, 23
 non facile; 11, 6 agebat; 12, 6 mollitus; 12, 3 relinquit; 12, 5
 aras; 12, 9 prodixit; 13, 12 discrepat; 14, 1 quaesierat; 15, 11 in-
 numeras; 15, 11 variaverit; 15, 13 deformis, 15, 13 in aera; 16,
 11 respondens; 17, 2 pavidas; 17, 6 feret; 18, 3 horror; 20, 5
 supplex lacrimis; 20, 12 redibo; 20, 16 vota futura; 21, 16 rursus;
 22, 1 praenosce; 22, 19 qui; 24, 16 rapidis; 25, 1 in unda; 25,
 10 immensis; 26, 12 gravidus; 27, 5 admovet; 31, 4 conditur ille
 suos; 33, 2 dabat; 33, 13 cuncta; 34, 4 rogabit; 35, 3 pignora
 cara; 35, 5 coeperat ut foetam; 36, 8 vertebat solidam; 36, 12 ire
 videt; 36, 18 vita diurna negat; 37, 2 incertis; 37, 13 compulsus;
 38, 5 expulsum; 38, 8 te quoque teste queant; 39, 16 quod facis
 esse; 40, 3 sed quia; 40, 7 vulpis; 41, 14 protinus; 42, 5 impiger;
 42, 14 rapido.

The following disagreements should be listed: 2, 3 rubris-
 rubeis, a careless reader might ^{in this manuscript} mistake r for e; 2, 6 perficeret-
 que- proficeretque, Cannegieter quotes a large number of manuscripts
 here, most of them wrongly; 3, 8 tentas- temptas, unimportant; 7,
 14 adgreditur- aggreditur, no manuscript of Avianus is consistent
 in observing assimilation of the final consonant of a preposition
 in composition; 14, 12 genetrix- genitrix, unimportant; 15, 1
 Trayiciem- Traiciem, Cannegieter erred in many citations of this
 passage; 19, 9 ast- att, unimportant; 28, 10 vacue falce, ^{calce(m.2)} this
 does occur in Cort.2 and is therefore probably a confusion of the

numerical symbols or a mistake of the printer; 29, 21 volo, omission ut, numquam and succederet; now 57 has numquam and succederet but volo and ut, while 55 (= Cort.3) has volo, omit ut, and reads numquam, but has succeerit(sic). Cannegieter has evidently confused and combined the readings of the second and the third Cortianus; 39, 5 adfuit- affuit, no manuscript of Avianus is consistent in the observance of assimilation of the final consonant of a preposition in composition; 39, 7 distendens- destendens, unimportant, especially when no other manuscript has- st (in the word, which is the more important feature); 41, 10 abire habere- abire, difficult to explain except on the ground of error on the part of Cannegieter or Cortius himself.

^{Despite} [Owing to] the fact that all 42 of the fables were examined for agreements and disagreements, the cases of failure to cite, tho' all listed, have not been recorded in this investigation, ^{partly} firstly, because they would occupy too much space, but mainly because the case being already proved their detailed quotation here would merely indicate the carelessness of Cortius in making his collation, or of Cannegieter in utilizing it.

Very strong collateral evidence is afforded by the existence of epimythia. In the following fables 57 has epimythia just where Cannegieter quotes them as existing in Cort.1: 6, 11, (appears in the margin as Cannegieter states); 14, (appears in margin as Cannegieter states) 17; 25; 26; 38. In the following passages 57 has certain specific readings which Cannegieter cites for Cort.1: 6, 14 nostra fabella; 17, 19 more volant clandestina verba nocentis, nec praescire palam laederis unde potes; 2, 5, 18 cum plus; 26, 13 ne citius doctis (scarcely legible but probably correct); 26, 13 cuisquam;

38, 13 si quis. Only one disagreement is found: 14, 17 homini-hominis, and that is of slight importance.

In ~~ten~~ following fables Cannegieter fails to list the presence in Cort.1 of epimythia which do appear in 61; 10, but this appears on the margin and may have been overlooked for that reason; 12, Prof. Cortius may not have considered these epimythia as of sufficient importance to be noted; 13, likewise appears on the margin; 15, 19, 22 rare epimythia appears; 24, on margin; 28; 31, on margin. Most of these epimythia are considered spurious and may have been ignored on that account by Cortius or Cannegieter.

The culminating proof of the identity of Cort.1 with 57 is found in the existence of the following description on the margin of the manuscript in a modern hand of the eighteenth century: "Cortianus primus apud Cannegieter". There is a possibility that this note may be due to the great Ephraim Lessing who was at one time Librarian of the Ducal Library of Wolfenbüttel where this manuscript is found. Lessing was interested in Fables and their tradition and his collected works contain numerous papers on Aesop; Babrius, Phaedrus, the Anonymus, Nevelet, Boner and Avianus and therefore it is not unnatural to suppose his interest would have led him to compare this manuscript with Cannegieter's citations.

A comparison of the handwriting of this note with the facsimile of Lessing's handwriting in Latin script in Karl Borinski's "Lessing", Berlin, 1900, shows that there is a very strong resemblance between these two.

Cort.2

For Cort.2 as for Cort.1 there was no external evidence on which to base a working hypothesis as to its identity (compare the

statement above regarding Cortianus.) Therefore, for internal evidence a similar record was made for the first twenty-two fables of all manuscripts in Dr. Oldfather's list with which each reading cited for Cort.2 agreed. In this comparison one manuscript was noticeable for its agreement with certain peculiar readings; this was 87.5 Aug. in the Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel (13).

On the assumption that this was the identical manuscript which Cannegieter quoted as Cort.2 the comparison was continued throughout the forty-two fables. So numerous and significant were the agreements that there can be no reasonable doubt that they are identical in spite of the lack of external evidence. In the following passages 56 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as Cort.2: 1, 8 sentit ; 1, 9 refers ; 2, 3 -sit(m.2) de-(m.2) -ris(m.2) -cca(m.2) rubis ; 2, 4 bacha ; 2, 15 sublato; 3, 4 ipsa; 3, 6 ne velis quemque(m.2) viro(m.2) ire; 4, 10 summotus; 4, 10 arva; 5, 1 quemcunque; 8, 13 sive ; 9, 13*unquam ... *inquit; 8, 14 *invidere ... *livide; 9, 19 in quid; 10, 5 absconso; 10, 12, qui; 12, 9 *numina ... *munera; 12, 11 subreptus; 14, 9 Limina, as far as manuscript is legible; 14, 10 ipse; 16, 3 timidus ; 17, 12 *alens ... *agens; 18, 18 dicere (this is, however, changed to discere tho' no mention^{is} made of this change); 19, 1 horrendos; 19, 11 *caesa ... *nunc laeta; 21, 7 praemeans prohibens *discere ... discedere, 56 has remeans but the rest of the peculiar reading tallies exactly with the citation of Cort.2, therefore this slight discrepancy may be disregarded; 21, 8 *extremo ... *externis; 21, 9 praestabat; 21, 13 dilata; 24, 6

(13) Guelferbytanus 87.5 Aug. S.XIII. membr. For convenience of reference I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "56", this being its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

sculpserat; 24, 15 *adspicies ... *adspiceres, 56 has *asspires ... *asspiceres but it is the only manuscript which has any such marginal reading and since this again is mere confusion of the final consonant of a preposition in composition, the discrepancy is not a serious one; 25, 10 dilatuissse; 26, 5 *scitici ... *cytici; 27, 6 pronior; 28, 11 excusam; 28, 15 n. deorat iniquitate ... (m.2) natura ... iniquae; 28, 16 que possit fieri; 29, 2 cincta; 29, 16 effusus; 29, 21 succedat in; 30, 5 accepti; 31, 6 petit ; 31, 10 affectum; 32, 1 ferentem ; 32, 8 movere; 32, 11 votis non flieti numina pigris; 33, 3 hac; 33, 4 ut liceat; 33, 5 cupidum (-dus in 56) cupiens evanescere; 33, 12 exegit; 34, 1 si quis; 34, 6 sustulit; 34, 13 tenderet; 34, 19 saltanti ; 35, 2 diludat et varias; 35, 16 meliora cupit; 36, 18 miserum; 37, 14 ait ; 37, 18 arva fero; 41, 12 *ait ... *aquis (m.2); 42, 8 immitem propria.

In the following passages 56 and two or three others are the only surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as Cort.2: 4, 7 impulsis (29); 4, 10 quo (22, 62, 65); 5, 3 nec detracta (27, 73); Paeoneo (2, 18); 11, 1 arripiens (1, 6, 12); 11, 11 me verbis (1, 6, 31); 14, 3 omine (38); 14, 12 cum (1, 6); 15, 11 pennas (28, 34); 17, 7 transjecit (86); 18, 5 collectis (51, 54, 66); 19, 9 quia (30); 20, 6 nam magna (15); 21, 2 ceres (65, 76); 21, 3 cupiens fragili (15); 25, 10 immersis (30, 51); 27, 1 conspexerat (10); 29, 8 timet (15); 29, 18 mostro duplici (14, 15); 30, 1 pingua rura (28, 31, 81); 30, 14 stultam (12, 68); 31, 7 vasto sermone (61). Other agreements, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts, may be listed as follows: 1, 13 nam quae praeda rogas; 1, 16 siquis; 2, 2 destituisset; 2, 11 tunc; 4, 6

discutienda; 4, 6 crescere; 7, 3 quondam; 7, 9 innexis; 7, 11 praemia; 7, 14 movens; 8, 11 irridens; 9, 5 cumque; 10, 5 praestant; 12, 1 mollitus; 12, 5 aras; 13, 4 qui solet esse gregis; 13, 9 demissis; 13, 9 fetosum; 14, 12 genetrix; 15, 11 innumeras; 15, 11 variaverit; 15, 13 in aera; 16, 11 respondens; 17, 2 pavidas; 17, 4 abesse; 17, 7 vulnera; 18, 3 horror; 19, 12 fueris; 20, 5 supplex lacrimis; 20, 10 rurus; 20, 12 Thalamum; 20, 12 redibo; 20, 16 vota futura; 21, 5 turbabat; 21, 11 dominum curvas; 21, 12 sentit adesse; 23, 5 ferret numina; 25, 11 sed post fallaci suscepta pericula voto; 26, 12 gravidus; 30, 13 demens; 30, 18 abstinuisse; 32, 3 frustra; 32, 3 depositis; 33, 3 finxerat; 34, 4 rogabit; 34, 6 ante; 34, 9 tanto; 34, 9 nimbo; 35, 5 ceperat ut foetam; 36, 15 suffere; 38, 5 expulsum; 38, 5 sub gurgite; phocas; 39, 3 et quae; 39, 10 adfirmas; 41, 17 post haec; 42, 8 cruentat; 42, 11 exime; 42, 15 duplici subeuntur tristia.

The following disagreements should be listed; 2, 6 perficeret que- proficeret que, Cannegieter quotes a long list of manuscripts for this reading, most of them wrongly; 3, 11 pravissima turpissima ... pravissima, this reading appears in 55 (= Cortianus 3), and is thus an error in quotation; 7, 11 ferre > ferri- ferri > ferre, Cannegieter may easily have misunderstood Cortius' note on this point; 7, 14 adgreditur- aggreditur, there is a lack of consistency in the manuscripts on the point of assimilation of the final consonant of a preposition in composition; 8, 13 tibi- this appears only in 55 (= Cortianus 3), and is thus an error in quotation; 9, 10 exanimem- examinem, unimportant; 13, 4 Cinyphai- Ciniphei, insignificant for *y* and *i*^{are} often confused; 13, 9 putride- putide, easily confused; 14 haec tamen- hanc tamen,

very much alike in appearance; 25, 2 rictibus fletibus- rictibus, the reading fletibus does, however, occur in a few other manuscripts and this may be ^{a case of} confusion with them, 25, 15 post hanc- post haec, insignificant; 29, 18 obstupeat- obstupuit, this reading is, however, found in Cort.3 and is probably merely a confusion of the numerical symbols of the two manuscripts; 32, 15 inquit- inquit, but Cort.3 again has inquit so this is a confusion of numbers again; 33, 1 quidam quondam- quidam, not easily explained; 33, 1 pretiosa- pretioso, insignificant error; 33, 5 cupidum- cupidus, insignificant discrepancy; 36, 15 quemquam- quamvis, Cort.3 has quemquam, so this is a numerical confusion; 37, 4 luxuriaeque- luxurieque, not serious; 38, 11 mercabilis- mercabitur, confusion with Cort.3 again; 39, 10 adfirmas- affirmas, insignificant; 42, 5 impiger- inpiger, insignificant.

In the following passages Cannegieter fails to cite a reading which varies from his own text: 1, 2 audiit- audit; 2, 4 indignans- indignum; 2, 9 quaerit- querit; 2, 12 haec- hec; 2, 13 ^{-t(m.2)} exosae- exose; 2, 16 poenas- penas; 3, 1 fert- fer ; 3, 2 hispida- hyspida; 3, 10 certior- cercior; 3, 11 nimis est- nimis; 4, 7 aether- ether; 4, 8 depluit- depulit; 4, 11 Phoebus- Phebus; 4, 16 praemisse- premissa; 5, 4 coeperat- ceperit; 5, 5 so " ..." ^{communiam(m.2)} forte(m.2); 5, 11 quoniam- quoniam ; 5, 14 verberibus que- verberibus, Cannegieter says one of the Cortii has omitted que. Is this the one he meant? 6, 11 haec- hec; aegrotis- egrotis; 6, 12 caeruleus- ceruleus; 7, 5 pavidae- pavidae; 7, 9 aera- era; 7, 10 ^{-t-(m.2)} quae- que; 7, 17 ostendatur- ostendatur; 9, 1 artum- arctum; 9, 6 ^{-m-(m.2)} praeceps- preceps; 9, 10 examinem- exaninem; 9, 22 mihi- michi; 10, 1 calvus- kalvus; 10, 10 quae- que; 11, 7 aerea- erea; 13, 7

provida- invida; 13, 10 insequitur- consequitur; 14, 1 pignora-
 pignoro; 14, 8 discutienda- discucienda; 16, 2 decidit- cecidit;
 16, 11 respondit canna suscurro- respondens * suscurro ... *canna
 (m.1); 17, 3 tum- tunc; 18, 4 amans- ovans; 18, 8 horret- terret;
 19, 2 facerent formae- facerent formae facerent; 19, 3 cunctis
 certamen- certamen cunctis; 20, 11 caerula- cerula; 20, 6 lucra-
 dampna; 20, 13 captum referens- referens captum; 20, 16 et rursum-
 est miserum; 25, 1 *undam ... *oram, this is not mentioned for
 Cort.2, yet it is quoted from Cort.3 which does not have such a read-
 calce(m.2)
 ing; 28, 10 vacue falce , no mention of this for Cort.2 yet it is
 cited for Cort.2 which does not have such a reading.

As will readily be seen the positive disagreements and omissions of variant readings are very few in number, considering that the examination of the manuscript was continued throughout the whole forty-two fables. They certainly do not afford evidence enough to offset the very numerous striking agreements.

Collateral proof is afforded by the existence of epimythia. In the following fables 56 has epimythia just where Cannegieter quotes them as existing in Cort.2: 26, 29. The following specific readings listed for Cort.2 appear in 56, 26, 13 verbis; 26, 14 sed si; 26, 14 perspice; 26, 14 quae movuit; 29, 23 *sed bene ... *qui (in margin); 29, 23 proloquitur.

The following disagreements must be noted: 6, Cannegieter reports the presence of an epimythium but none is found in 56; this may be due to a confusion with Cort.2 or Cort.3 both of which have an epimythium for fable 6; 12 epimythium present- epimythium lacking, again both Cort.1 and 3 have the epimythium; 13 epimythium present in margin- lacking entirely, probably confusion with Cort.1

which does have an epimythium in the margin. There is only one failure to cite an epimythium appearing in 56, and that is for fable 27 where a rare epimythium appears which Cannegieter makes no mention of for Cort.2; but again the argument from failure to cite has little weight.

Cort.3

For Cort.3 as for Cort.1 and 2 there was no external evidence upon which to base a working hypothesis as to its identity (for lack of external evidence on the Cortiani see above on Cort.1). Therefore, the discovery of this manuscript among those existing to-day must depend upon internal evidence. For the first twenty-two fables a record was made of all the manuscripts in Dr. Oldfather's list with which each reading cited for Cort.3 agreed. As in the cases of Cort.1 and Cort.2 one manuscript was noticeable for its agreement with certain peculiar readings. It is important to note that this manuscript is likewise in the Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel where it is catalogued as 37.34 Aug. (14).

On the assumption that this was the identical manuscript which Cannegieter quoted as Cort.3 the comparison was continued throughout the forty-two fables. So numerous and significant were the agreements that there can be no reasonable doubt that they are identical. In the following passages 55 is the only surviving manuscript which has the same reading as Cort.3: 1, 12 vix miserum;
me(m.2)
2, 14 non sive labore magno suprema peti; 5, 3 faciunt; 5, 18 sed;
nitido(m.2)
7, 12 consimilem; 9, 15 quam vis credens; 10, 2 nudo ; 10, 9

(14) Guelferbytanus, 37, 34 Aug. S. XIII. membr. For convenience of reference I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "55", which is its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

(m.2)
videns; 11, 1 arripiens (margin) ... eripiens; 15, 8 solverat;
16, 13 saenasque; 16, 12 tuo; 16, 19 dicta meis movent; 17, 13
facto; 17, 14 nam solitas ira dolorque rapit voces; 17, 15 ab
aggere; 18, 12 connexum; 19, 1 torrentes; 19, 9 tribuunt; 19, 11
tamen; 20, 4 ac; 20, 5 ita supplex; 20, 9 tenerisque; 21, 1 pro-
genie; 21, 6 ribus; 21, 9 coram; 21, 3 dilectam linquite; 21, 14
frugibus; 22, 4 unus invidus; 22, 8 protinus hoc; 22, 13 socium
captantem; 23, 6 reddet ut; 23, 8 spes et pretium; 23, 14 se
nocuisse; 23, 14 volunt; 24, 4 sorte (almost impossible to decide
whether the reading of 55 is forte or sorte); 24, 5 docte magis;
24, 15 marmure solo; 24, 16 sata (hard to tell whether fata or
sata in 55); 25, 1 puta considit; 25, 5 rupti; 25, 7 manus improba
a.l.vestem(m.2)
mentem ; 25, 15 quisquis sibi; 25, 15 post haec; 26, 5 pax
prata; 27, 2 parvam; 27, 14 sed; 27, 8 potanti; 28, 2 juga; 28, 3
falce; 28, 14 uno pectore; 29, 2 cincta; 29, 5 cratura plena; 29,
rura(m.2)
21 avis; 30, 1 pingua cultu ; 30, 3 reverens; 30, 5 rursus
excepta; 30, 17 haec illos praecepta; 31, 5 torvum murem; 31, 8
callitate; 32, 2 torrentem; 32, 5 corrector; 34, 1 patitur; 34, 8
deriguere gelu ... delituere (margin); 34, 17 nam mihi de summo; 35,
3 unum namque caro; 35, 15 ordine versa; 36, 3 pudes; 36, 14 qui quae ;
36, 16 quam tenes; 37, 6 cupiens; 37, 7 quia; 37, 9 perarras; 37,
12 hic; 37, 18 quaelibet anta (antra in 55; anta is probably a
misprint as Cannegieter goes on to say that antra might be ac-
cepted); 38, 6 verbera; 39, 9 latere; 39, 11 cogi; 39, 15 posset
laetare; 39, 16 saevior haec; 40, 3 dissimilis; 40, 4 omne genus.
In the following passages 55 and two or three others are the only
surviving manuscripts which have the same reading as Cort.3: 1, 8
jejunium (68); 2, 5 quod tardo (1, 6, 12, 38); 9, 19 detulit et

(2); 9, 22 semper misero (28, 68); 11, 5 fragilis (2, 15); 12, 3 properanter linquit (12); 16, 1 ex summis (6, 12); 17, 16 quaeque olim oculis sit (51); 20, 15 stultum (3, 12, 14, 54); 21, 10 ast (2); 22, 20 in sua damna cupit (3, 12, 21, 57); 23, 12 munera (12); 24, 6 ingenio; 26, 5 citici (4); 29, 2 arma (16, 13); 30, 17 movent (25, 31); 34, 16 solet (7, 15); 35, 3 dilexit (10, 12, 15); 35, 10 appositum (10); remisit; 35, 13 succederet (51, 66, 81); 36, 10 herbosa proculuisse (12, 38); 38, 5 patris (34); 40, 3 variarunt (57). Other agreements, less significant because found in a good many manuscripts, may be listed as follows: 1, 2 rapido; 1, 3 audit; 1, 9 defers; 1, 13 namque rogas praedam; 2, 2 destituisset; 3, 3 cupiens facili; 3, 6 ne velis; 3, 8 pronos; 4, 10 quo, 4, 11 crescere; 5, 4 remeare; 5, 12 lustra feras; 5, 18 qui quondam; 7, 8 rapido; 7, 13 hunc; 7, 14 movens; 7, 17 ostendatur; 8, 11 irridens; 9, 10 relisit; 12, 5 aras, 12, 9 cur; prodixit; 13, 5 hunc; 13, 7 locutus est; 13, 10 tremor; 14, 1 quaesierat; 14, 10 et; 15, 11 variaverit; 15, 13 in aera; 16, 9 nondum; 17, 2 pavidas; 17, 11 dic quis; 8, 4 et a pastu; 8, 9 et quamvis; 8, 18 ut; 19, 14 quam malles spinas; 21, 5 turbabat; 21, 8 extremis; 21, 11 dominum curvas; 21, 13 tunc ait; 22, 1 praenoscere; 22, 5 se; 22, 7 quodcumque rogaverit; 23, 3 commissa; 23, 14 aut; 24, 2 quidem; 24, 11 vestri; 24, 16 rapidis; 26, 9 vera licet moveas; 26, 12 gravidus; 28, 5 nectit; 28, 11 dispersit; 28, 16 quo; 29, 6 continuasse; 29, 14 hominis; 29, 20 expulsum; 30, 15 demens; 30, 18 abstinuisse; 31, 4 ille suos; 31, 6 petit; 32, 3 frustra; dispositis; 32, 2 dabat; 33, 3 finxerat; 33, 8 quae tam continuo; 33, 13 quicumque cuncta; 34, 4 rogabit; 34, 13 tonderet; 35, 2 cara; 35, 5 ceperat ut foetam; 35, 7 manibus et; 36, 11 conspicit; 36, 12

ire videt; 36, 15 suffere; 37, 3 tenduntur; 37, 14 animo; ait; 38, 2 adibat; 38, 5 expulsum; 38, 6 dabat; 39, 7 descendens; 39, 10 adfirmans (affirmans in 55).

The following disagreements should be listed: 1, 9 ex more-de more, this may be due to a confusion with Cort.2 which has ex more; 2, 6 perficeretque- proficeretque, out of the six manuscripts which Cannegieter quotes for this reading only two tally with his citation; 3, 3 praecedere- procedere, there is much confusion of the prefixes prae and pro throughout the manuscripts of Avianus; 6, 2 tantum luteis- luteis tantum, mere change of order, very little importance; 6, 7 Paeonio- Peyonio^{there is}, much confusion among manuscripts and editions as to the spelling of this word and Cannegieter may have misunderstood the collation; 7, 14 adgreditur- aggreditur, no manuscript of Avianus consistently observes the assimilation of the final consonant of a preposition in composition; 8, 6 magnis-magni, insignificant; 10, 5 cuius- huius, so much alike in this style of handwriting that the one might easily be mistaken for the other; 10, 5 praestant- perflant, there is much confusion of the manuscripts upon this reading; 11, 1 arripiens- eripiens ... arripiens (m.2), half the truth and therefore of but little weight as a disagreement; 11, 12 discutiendus- discuciendus, in this manuscript t and c are almost indistinguishable; 13, 9 fetosum- setosum, Cort.2 has this reading so this error may be merely a confusion of the numerical symbols of the two manuscripts; 16, 15 paullatim surgentes- surgentes paulatim, mere change of order not very important and the doubling of l is of small significance; 19, 10 cunctus viam- cuncti viam, so nearly alike as to be an argument for rather than against identity; 22, 8 ferer- feret, so much alike

that the disagreement rather constitutes an argument for than against identity; 22, 14 suscipiunt- suspiciunt, this might be a mere mistake in copying owing to the similarity in ^{und}son~~da~~; 22, 19 cui- cur, very much alike, the one could easily be mistaken for the other; 23, 14 prodesse- aliis- prodesse magis, there is much confusion in the manuscripts on this passage; 24 sic se- se sic, the note of the collator might easily have been inverted in copying; 25, 1 ad undam ... oram (in margin)- ad undam, Cort.2 has this reading therefore it is probably a confusion with that manuscript; 25, 6 ac auri- ac avari, a careless observer might have mistaken avari for auri; 25, 10 immensus ... immersus (in margin)- immersus ... immensus (in margin), but 55 is the only manuscript which has any marginal reading and since it is the exact converse of the citation it is probably an error on the part of Cannegieter; 33, 1 pretiosa- pretioso, unimportant; 25, 3 pignora- pignora, insignificant; 36, 2 arma- ama(?), almost illegible easily mistaken for arma; 36, 16 peritura- paritura, Cannegieter says "male Cort.3 peritura", yet there is nothing peculiar about peritura- which is in fact his own text reading, he must have meant paritura? This is probably then an error of the printer; 37, 4 luxuriata- luxuriat, perhaps mere mistake of printer; 39, 7 litun- licum(?), almost illegible just a series of straight lines, only a conjecture in any case, very little weight as a disagreement; 39, 10 adfirmans- affirmans, insignificant discrepancy. It will readily be observed that these disagreements are neither numerous nor important enough to offset the very remarkable agreements. Since the agreements proved to be so numerous and significant for the forty-two fables, the cases of failures to cite tho' listed were not recorded here since

the argument ex silentio is of such small value in the proof.

Strong collateral proof is afforded by the existence of epimythia. In the following fables epimythia appear in 55 just where they are quoted by Cannegieter as appearing in Cort.3: 6, 10, 11, in margin; 12, two verses in the margin; 14; 15; 19; 22; 25; 26; 29; 33; 38; 39. In the following passages 55 has certain specific readings which are quoted as existing in Cort.3: 6, 13 quisquis; 6, 14 quae nequit; 6, 14 nostra fabella; 10, 15 de se risu quicumque novo sciat esse ~~V~~etentum, Arte magis certat quam ... minis; 11, 16 cum pare erit (sit in 55) melior; 12, 14 sint tua vota tibi; 12, 16 si quid; 15, 15 forsitan; 19, 15 nimio; 19, 17 cum pulcher; 22, 21 invidus ut non sis, nec avarus nostra fabella Edocet, his casibus ne similem subeas; 25, 17 nullas homo; 26, 13 non tutum est placidis; 26, 13 credere; 26, 15 quae si; 26, 15 dum moveas; 29, 23 proloquitur; 29, 24 hic invisus erit; 33, 15 amittit totum, qui tendit ad omnia votum; 38, 13 extremis; 39, 17 non refert an sis ... , causa mali sola lex ad utrum que facit.

Four slight disagreements occur in the citation of epimythia: 11, 16 erit- sit, but since the rest of the epimythium agrees with the citation this discrepancy is minimized; 12, 15 acceptis- accep- to, here also the other quotations from the epimythium tally exactly so that this is of small importance; 14, 15 homini- hominis, of small importance; 15, 15 et- et omitted, of small importance.

In four instances the epimythia of 55 are not cited for Cort.3, i.e. for fables 13, 20, 21 and 24. This is the more noticeable in that for the last two fables the epimythia of 55 are singular and not found elsewhere. It is readily seen that these slight discrepancies and omissions are of little importance beside the

agreements on the appearance of epimythia and their specific readings.

As a final correspondence to clinch the argument for identity it may be observed that C.3 ends abruptly with 40.7 in the middle of a fable, which is also true of 55 and of no other manuscript.

P.

In his preface Cannegieter states that he takes his collation of P directly from the edition of Theodore Pulmann who collated this manuscript with two others which he said belonged to the College of St. Catherine at Nimwegen. (*Accipe nunc Editiones reliquas, quae ad manus nostras pervenerunt. Prima est Theodori Pulmanni Craneburgii. Membrae tres, in calce libri hae memorantur: Liber Canonicorum Noviomagensium Collegii Catherinae. 2. Eiusdem Collegii alter. 3. Ipsius Pulmanni.*) For the last mentioned Codex as for the three Cortiani there is no external evidence since there is no manuscript specifically known to-day as having been formerly in the College of St. Catherine at Nimwegen nor as having been collated by Pulmann. Therefore, the identification of P (if it be in existence now) must be based upon internal evidence.

Since we still have the same collations (15) made by Pulmann which Cannegieter used, it is a valuable test of the accuracy of Cannegieter's own work, to compare the quotations of Cannegieter with the actual readings in Pulmann's edition. In the following passages Cannegieter quotes from Pulmann's collation of P in such

(15) Dr. Oldfather made a copy of the readings from the 1585 reprint of Pulmann's 1572 edition, in the library of Harvard University.

a vague and indefinite manner that it is indicative of carelessness: 11, 12 *discutiendus*- Cannegieter states this reading appears in two of the Codices used by Pulmann; 21, 6 *suaserat et a laribus*- appears in one of the Codices used by Pulmann; 28, 10 *vacua calce*- appears in one Codex of Pulmann; 29, 18 *sufflat*- appears in two of the Codices; 32, 3 *depositis*- appears in two of the Codices; 34, 2 appears in two of the Codices; 42, 5 *impiger*- appears in one Codex. In the following instances Cannegieter quotes incorrectly a citation from Pulmann (the first reading is that of Cannegieter and the second that of Pulmann): 5, 12 *turbavit*- *torbavit*; 7, 14 *adgreditur*- *aggreditur*; 7, 14 *ferret numina* (in P)- *ferret numina* quoted only for A and N; 37, 2 *immissis*- *immistis*; 42, 15 *tristicia*- *tristitia*. Besides these vague references and incorrect quotations Cannegieter fails to cite some significant readings which Pulmann notes as existing in P: 2, 10 *fero*; 6, 12 *lustra feras*; 8, 6 *magnum*; 9, 21 *dixit*; 10, 2 *nudo*; 10, 11 *referens positos*; 12, 5 *aras*; 17, 7 *viscera*; 20, 6 *heu*; 20, 11 *pastur*; 20, 12 *redibo*; 23, 8 *agat*; 23, 9 *mavis*; 23, 11 *fati*; 25, 7 *vestem*; 26, 12 *habes*; 28, 7 *verbera*; 29, 21 *quisquam*; 29, 22 *gerat*; 30, 9 *tunc*; 30, 12 *cor*; 30, 13 *domini*; 30, 16 *toties*; 31, 6 *esse*; 31, 11 *membris*; 31, 12 *et facies*; 31, 12 *petit*; 34, 6 *ipsa cavis*; 35, 2 *dividit*; 35, 3 *cara*; 35, 3 *eduxit*; 35, 10 *remittit*; 38, 5 *sub*; 38, 8 *queant*; 39, 15 *posses*; 41, 18 *facta*; 42, 14 *rapido fauces exsatiare lupo*; 42, 15 *suberit duplici*.

These cases are sufficient to prove that the failure to note variant readings in other manuscripts is no evidence at all that Cannegieter's collators had not noticed them, or that Cannegieter himself had no opportunity to know of their existence.

For investigation of the internal evidence a record was made of all the manuscripts in Dr. Oldfather's list with which each reading of P agreed. Out of a total of sixty-five citations fifty-eight agreed with Londiniensis 10090 (16). In the following passages. 14 is the only manuscript which has the reading quoted for P: 9, 13 ast; 11, 5 solidae et fragilis; 25, 6 auri conqueritur; 40, 10 esse potest. Only one of these is at all significant i.e., 11, 5 and this is a mere inversion and therefore not of extremely great importance. In the following passages 14 together with other manuscripts (usually 54 and 34 are among the number) agrees with the reading cited for P: 1, 13 namque rogas praedam; 1, 13 possit; 2, 11 tunc; 3, 6 ne; 3, 8 pedes; 4, 6 discutienda; 4, 14 resedit; 5, 4 remeare; 5, 12 pavidas; 5, 18 qui; 7, 9 innexis; 7, 11 praemia; 7, 13 hunc; 8, 11 irridens; 9, 10 relisit; 11, 12 discutiendus; 12, 9 prodixit; 14, 11 haec tamen; 15, 13 in aera; 16, 5 ast; 17, 2 pavidas; 17, 4 abesse; 18, 12 collatum; 18, 15 illis; 20, 10 rursus; 20, 15 stultum; 21, 6 suaserat et a laribus; 21, 11 dominum curvas; 22, 1 praenoscere; 22, 14 prodesse; 24, 10 rapido; 24, 13 sed si; 24, 16 rapidis; 25, 10 in mediis; 26, 12 gravidus; 28, 5 nectit; 28, 10 vacua calce; 28, 16 quo fieri; 29, 18 sufflat; 29, 20 expulsum; 30, 15 demens; 31, 4 ipse; 31, 7 hunc; 32, 8 levare; 33, 1 an^ser erat quondam; 33, 2 dabat; 34, 2 mala; 34, 5 ereptos; 35, 5 ceperat; 35, 11 ab hirsuto; 36, 12 admoto; 36, 12 ire videt; 36, 16 compescantque; 40, 3 sed quia.

In the following passages 14 does not agree with the citation for P: 4, 9 lateri duplicem- duplicem lateri; 4, 10, qua-

(16) Londin. Add. 10090, S. XIV. membr. For convenience of quotation I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "14", which is its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

quod; 24, 16 rapidis- rabidis; 32, 3 depositis- dispositis; 33, 13 cuicumque- qui cuncta; 34, 11 decolor- discolor; 37, 2 immissis (according to Cannegieter but Pulmann's collation is actually immistis)- incertis; 42, 5 impiger- inpiger.

The evidence connecting 14 with P would appear insufficient for proof, were it not for the fact that on London. 10090, a modern hand has occasionally entered marginal notes of manuscripts called "A" and "N". These are first quoted in fable 17, "A affixum; A, N fractoque loqui vix", which Pul. writes in his text, then on 30, 13 "A, N, iustam" where 14 (and Pul. states the same of P) has domini, which demonstrates the identity. This conjunction of readings from manuscripts called "A" and "N" in the margin of a manuscript whose readings agree with P indicates clearly that in 14 we have Pulmann's P with his own annotations in the margin.

A = Antwerp No. 140

As in the case of P Cannegieter states that he takes his collation of A directly from the edition of Theodore Pulmann who reported that the manuscript belonged to the College of St. Catherine at Nimwegen (see above on P). For this Codex there is no external evidence since there is no manuscript specifically known to-day as having been formerly in the College of St. Catherine at Nimwegen nor as having been collated by Pulmann. Therefore the identification of A (if it be in existence now) must be based upon internal evidence.

Since we still have the same collations of Pulmann which Cannegieter used, we may, as in the case of P, test the accuracy of Cannegieter's work. For A may be noticed the same vagueness of reference which appeared in the case of P. In many cases a reading

check readings with Antares 14c = 671

is quoted merely as appearing in two of the codices which Pulmann used, or some similarly inexact method of citation (see on 11, 10; 11, 12; 26, 8, 29, 18; 32, 3; 34, 2; 34, 11; 35, 11). In the following instances Cannegieter quotes incorrectly citations from Pulmann (the first reading is that of Cannegieter and the second that of Pulmann): 7, 14 adgreditur- aggreditur, this strengthens the assertion in the discussion of a previous manuscript that Cannegieter was in error on this citation; 37, 2 insans- insanis, there might be some doubt on this point since Dr. Oldfather's copy of Pulmann's readings was made from the 1785 reprint of Pulmann's 1572 edition, in the second edition some changes may have been made in manuscript readings. In addition to these vague references and incorrect citation Cannegieter fails to cite some significant readings which Pulmann notes as existing in A: 2, 10 fero; 4, 6 discutiendus; 5, 12 lustra feras; 6, 5 quod; 7, 6 conscius; 8, 6 magnum; 10, 2 nudo, 10, 11 referens positos; 11, 1 accipiens; 12, 6 aram; 13, 4 solet esse gregis; 17, 6 ille; 17, 7 emisso transjecit viscera ferro; 20, 11 pastus; 22, 18 inde; 23, 5 numina; 23, 8, agat; 23, 9 mavis; 23, 11 fati; 25, 7 vestem; 25, 11 fallaci; voto; 28, 7 verbera; 28, 12 agat; 30, 9 tunc; 30, 12 cor; 30, 16 toties; 31, 6 ipse; 31, 11 membris; 31, 12 ut faciat; 35, 2 dividit; 35, 3 produxit; 35, 10 remittit. These facts prove that Cannegieter did not use all his available material and presumably that he was likewise to a proportionate degree inaccurate in his collation of other manuscripts.

For investigation of the internal evidence a record was made of all the manuscripts in Dr. Oldfather's list with which each reading of A agrees. The citations of A agree with the

following manuscripts: 1, 13 namque rogas praedam; 1, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15-19, 25, 28, 30, 31, 34, 38, 54, 55, 68; 3, 6 ne, 1, 2, 3, 5-8, 11, 12, 14-19, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 38, 54, 55, 61, 62, 63, 68, 69, 72, 77, 81; 4, 10; 1, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 20, 28, 31, 34, 35, 38, 52, 54, 59, 66, 68, 69, 81, 86; 4, 14 resedit, 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 22, 24, 28, 30, 31, 34, 55, 62, 68, 77; 5, 4 remeare, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, 36, 38, 54, 55, 77, 81, 86; 5, 12 pavidas, all but 5, 7, 16, 17, 22, 28, 34, 51, 53, 55, 56, 66, 68; 7, 9 innexis, all but 30, 31, 38, 55, 61; 7, 11 praemia, all but 3, 6, 12, 38, 81; 9, 10 relisit, 11, 13-18, 25, 29, 30, 31, 38, 55, 69; 19, 13 ast; 9, 21 multa, 6, 11, 12, 30, 31, 38, 86; 11, 10 et quia multa fides cum meliore brevi (A not mentioned but found in Pul.) 13, 18; 11, 12 discutiendus, 5, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 25, 28, 36, 55, 63; 13, 5 hunc vir- no manuscript; 14, 11 haec tamen 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 22, 24, 25, 26, 30, 34, 38, 55, 63, 77, 81, 84; 15, 13 in aera, 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11-22, 24-28, 30-32, 34, 35, 42, 53, 54, 55, 56, 61-63, 65, 66, 68, 77, 81, 84, 86; 17, 2 pavidas, 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 38, 51, 54, 55, 56, 61, 63, 68, 77, 81; 17, 4 abesse, 1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 24, 25, 26, 30, 34, 51, 54, 56, 63, 66, 69, 81; 17, 7 transjecit, 1, 38, 56, 86; 18, 12 collatum, 14, 34, 38, 68; 18, 15 illis, all but 55, 61, 66; 20, 10 rursus, 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 34, 51, 54, 56, 61, 63, 66, 68, 69, 77, 79; 21, 11 dominum curvas, 1, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24, 31, 56, 61; 22, 1 praenosceret 14, 28, 38, 55, 77; 24, 10 rapido, 1, 3, 4, 7, 9-18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 30-32, 34, 38, 55, 59, 66, 68, 69, 77, 81; 24, 16 rapidis,

1, 3, 4, 7, 9-13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30-32, 34, 54, 55, 56, 59, 65, 68, 69, 77, 81; 25, 15 *post haec*, 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 16, 20, 24, 32, 34, 51, 59, 77; 26, 8 *insinuare*, 1; 26, 12 *gravidus*, 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 34, 42, 53, 56, 59, 60, 62, 65, 68, 73, 81; 28, 5 *nectit*, 1, 3, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 31, 38, 54, 73, 77, 81; 28, 16 *quo fieri*, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9-17, 20, 21, 22, 24-29, 32, 34, 38, 42, 53, 54, 59, 60, 62, 63, 66, 68, 69, 73, 81, 84, 86; 29, 18 *sufflat*, 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, 17, 20, 22, 25, 29, 31, 32, 38, 59, 62, 65, 76; 29, 20 *expulsum*, 1, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 25, 28, 31, 51, 54, 61, 66, 68, 69, 77, 81; 30, 5 *demens*, all but 16; 32, 3 *depositis*, 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 16, 20, 24-29, 31, 38, 53, 54, 56, 61, 62, 66, 69, 73, 77; 32, 2 *dabat*, 1, 3, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 28, 34, 68; 34, 2 *mala*, all but 60, 86; 34, 5 *ereptos*, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15-17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38, 53, 54, 60, 62, 63, 65, 68, 69, 73, 76, 81; 34, 11 *decolor* (no record of ms. authority in Pul.), 4, 9, 32, 41, 53, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 73, 76, 86; 35, 3 *produxit*- no manuscript; 35, 5 *ceperat*, 1, 3, 5, 7-9, 11-17, 19, 24-26, 28, 31, 34, 35, 38, 51, 54, 56, 66, 63, 66, 68, 69, 76, 77, 81; 35, 7 *sibi pectore*, no manuscript; 35, 11 *ab hirsuto* (no manuscript quoted), 1, 3, 5, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19-21, 24-27, 29, 41, 53, 54, 59, 60, 65, 68, 73, 77, 81; 36, 12 *ire pavet*, 13, 18; 37, 2 *insans* (*insanis* is actually Pulmann's reading) no manuscript; 37, 16 *compescant que*, 1, 3, 4, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 28, 31, 34, 51, 54, 65, 68, 69, 76, 77, 81, 86; 42, 8 *immeritaque gemens*, 16, 17, 18, 25, 34, 51; 42, 14 *quam rapido facices ex satiari lupo*, 14.

It is noticeable that there are three citations with which

no manuscript agrees, namely, 13, 5 hunc, vir; 35, 7 sibi pectore; 37, 2 insans (insanis). Out of a total of forty-nine citations, twenty-five agree with manuscript 34, but none of these agreements are peculiar or significant enough to indicate this manuscript as the one which Cannegieter was quoting as A. None of the readings are distinctive and they agree in general with a large number of manuscripts thus indicating no particular manuscript as the one which Cannegieter quotes as A. The only conclusion that can be reached as to the identity of this manuscript is that there is a close agreement with P and that its readings agree generally with 14, 18 and 34. It is therefore probably a late manuscript of comparatively small value.

N = *Antw* p 84

As in the cases of A and P Cannegieter states that he takes his collation of N directly from the edition of Theodore Pulmann who reported that the manuscript belonged to the College of St. Catherine at Nimwegen (see above on P). For this codex, likewise, there is no external evidence, since, as stated previously, there is no manuscript specifically known to-day as having been formerly in the College of St. Catherine at Nimwegen nor as having been collated by Pulmann. Therefore the identification of N (if it be in existence at present) must be based upon internal evidence.

Cannegieter quotes quite a number of readings from N but these are for most part evidence of carelessness on his part for Pulmann actually cites N in only two instances namely, for the spelling "Avianus" in the title; and 23, 5 numina, which Cannegieter cites accurately. Apparently Pulmann made N the basis of his text and cited variants from A and P, but there is no statement anywhere

to this effect in Pulmann's own edition. Therefore, Cannegieter's quotations are mere inferences, as he assumes that N has what Pulmann gives in his text if P and A have different readings. This is an unsafe criterion for the listing of variant readings and for this reason no proof for the identity of N can be based on such evidence. The following passages are instances of Cannegieter's careless method of inference: 2, 6 perficeret que, Cannegieter quotes this for N, it does appear but Pulmann cites P and A for this reading; 4, 10 quo, Cannegieter cites for N, it does appear in the text but Pulmann does not mention N; 25, 7 mentem, Cannegieter says this appears in one codex but does not state which one; 28, 7 vulnera, Cannegieter cites for N, it does appear in the text but Pulmann does not mention N; 35, 2 dividat, Cannegieter says Pulmann cites this "ex codice suo Neomagensium"; 35, 10 relinquit, Cannegieter cites for N, "ex Neomagensi Codice"; 35, 11 ab hirsuto, Cannegieter cites for N, it does appear in ^{The} text but Pulmann does not mention N.

Pal.

Cannegieter states in his preface that he takes his collation of what he calls the "Palatinus" from the edition of Isaac Nevelet (the edition Frankfurt 1610. Dr. Oldfather has listed Nevelet's readings of the Palatinus from the 1660 reprint, likewise of Frankfurt, which is in ^{The} Boston Public Library) who used this manuscript for correcting his text (Isaacus Nicholaus Neveletus anno 1610 publicavit Avianum, in quo purgando usus est Palatino Codice manu exarato). On the conjecture that this was a Palatinus manuscript a comparison of citations was made with the only known

Palatine manuscript of Avianus, i.e., Palatinus 1573 (17) in the Vatican Library at Rome.

It is noticeable in comparing quotations of Cannegieter with the readings Nevelet actually reported that not a single disagreement occurs- evidence that Cannegieter might be accurate when he chose.

In the following passages 72 agrees with the citations for Pal.: 2, 10 occidit infelix alitis ungue fero; 5, 18 qui quondam; 7, 9 innexis; 13, 2 tutaque desertis quaereret antra jugis; 15, 2 continuasse; 18, 10 taurorum (appears in 72 but only in m.2); 18, 13 animos; 29, 3 haesit in adversa nimborum mole; 30, 12 cor rapuisse; 31, 6 quem petat esse videt; 32, 3 depositis; 34, 1 transisse; 34, 5 solibus ereptos; 34, 8 arvaque sub rigido; 35, 10 remisit; 38, 8 te quoque teste queant; 38, 11 emptor; 42, 4 constitit.

In the following passages 72 does not agree with the readings cited for Pal.: 13, 10 insequiturque- consequiturque; 15, 12 sordida terga- florida terga; 19, 14 quam malles- quam velles; 22, 9 quae- si; 40, 2 inter consimiles respuit ire feras- inter consimiles ibat in arua feras; 42, 5 impiger- inpiger; 42, 8 imitem propera morte cruentat humum- immerita gemens morte cruentat humum. Of these disagreements two of the readings do not agree with the readings of any of the known manuscripts namely, 15, 12 sordida terga; 40, 2 inter consimiles respuit ire feras.

In no single case is 72 the only manuscript which agrees

(17) Palat. Bibl. Apost. Vat. Rome, S. XIII. membr. For convenience of quotation I shall henceforward refer to this manuscript as "72", which is its number in Dr. Oldfather's list.

with the reading given for Pal., nor in a comparison of citations with all the manuscripts in Dr. Oldfather's list does any other manuscript appear whose peculiar or significant agreements would indicate a possible identity with Pal. On account of the lack of significant agreements with 72 and the large number of serious disagreements Pal. cannot, indeed, be identified with 72, but since eighteen out of a total of twenty-six citations of Pal. do agree with 72, we are justified in concluding that it belonged to the same general group.

M

Cannegieter states in his preface that M was one of six manuscripts which Nicholas Heinze collated and Francis Burmann copied (see above in Col.1). Cannegieter confessed that it was not quite certain what this manuscript was, but added that Peter Burmann thought it was a Medicean manuscript (*Sextus cuius esset, non constabat; clarissimus tamen Burmann suspicabatur eum esse Mediceum*). By reason of this conjecture a comparison was made of the citations for M with the following Medicean manuscripts now in the Laurentian Library at Florence: Plut. LXVIII, 24; [Ash. 1813]; Plut. 91, Sup. 4. It was soon evident, however, from the vast proportion of disagreements that none of these could be that manuscript which Cannegieter quotes as M.

Since external evidence affords no clue, it is necessary once more to fall back upon internal evidence. A record was made of all the manuscripts in Dr. Oldfather's list with which each reading of M agreed.

The record of agreements of the manuscripts of Dr. Old-

father's list with each citation of M is as follows: Praef.
 4 dubitandi, 32; 5 quomodo, 32, 59 (m.1); 6 occurrunt, 32, 59; 13
 munitus, 32; 17 Brachius 32; 20 usque ad quadraginta, 62; 23 ab-
 lectes 60; 23 sollicitudines, 32, 42, 59; 27 singularem, 32, 59;
 1, 1 deflentem, 27, 59, 60; 1, 1 parvum, 29, 32, 42 59, 60, 65, 73,
 76, 84; 1, 11 maligne, 32; 1, 13 namqua praeda rogas, 32; 2, 1
 pinnatis, 32, 42, 59; 2, 3 rubri, 59 (has -s in m.2); 2, 5 indig-
 num, 4, 27, 32, 42, 53, 59, 63, 66, 84; 2, 6 perficeretque, 4, 9,
 20, 27, 29, 53, 60, 62, 63, 66, 69, 77; 2, 13 quieti, 1, 2, 3, 5,
 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 34, 38,
 40, 50, 53, 56, 68, 69, 77; 3, 2 relesit, 32; 5, 5 defuncti, 32,
 59, 84; 5, 12 pavidas, 1-4, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20, 24-27, 29,
 31, 32; 38, 42, 54, 55, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 69, 73, 76, 77, 80,
 81, 84, 86; 5, 18 qui quondam, 1-7, 9, 11, 12, 14-17, 18, 20, 22,
 25-32, 34, 36, 38, 42, 53, 54-56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 68, 73, 76,
 80, 81, 84, 86; 6, 5 quo, 11, 26, 27, 29, 32, 42, 53, 59-61, 63,
 66, 73; 7, 8 rapido, 1-3, 5-7, 11, 12, 14, 16-18, 24, 25, 28,
 30-32, 34, 38, 54, 55, 59, 66, 69, 81; 7, 9 innexis, all but 4,
 30, 31, 38, 55, 61; 7, 8 molam, 32, 59, 60, 61; 9, 22 qui, 32;
 14, 2 qui (m.2, 3 obvious misprint) 7, 22, 27, 29, 32, 42, 53,
 59, 60, 65, 66, 73, 81; 18, 6 cupiet, 9, 22, 26, 27, 29, 32, 62,
 73, 76, 77; 19, 10 dispectum, 32; 19, 12 sed nostris frueris, 18,
 42, 59; 19, 13 succidat, 6, 8, 19, 22, 32, 35, 42, 53, 59, 60, 62,
 66, 69, 77, 84; 21, 2 qui, 32; 22, 3 numina, 4, 9, 11, 15, 21, 22,
 24, 26, 27, 29, 32, 42, 53, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 73, 76,
 79, 81, 84, 86; 22, 7 praestandi, 3, 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, 22, 24-26,
 28-31, 38, 42, 54, 65; 22, 7 quae speraverit 1, 28, 29, 32, 42,
 56, 59, 60; 23, 5 ferret numina, 4, 7, 12, 27, 29, 32, 42, 53, 56,

59, 60, 63, 66, 73; 23, 11 nequitiae, 32, 42, 59, 86; 24, 10 rapido, 1, 3, 4, 7, 9-18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 30-32, 38, 59, 66, 68, 69, 77, 81; 24, 11 vestri, 13, 22, 32, 42, 53, 59, 65, 66, 76, 81; 25, 11 sed post fallaci suscepta pericula voto, 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 51, 53, 56, 62, 63, 65, 68, 69, 76, 81, 86; 26, 7 ille gemens, 59, 63; 26, 12 gravidus, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 42, 53, 56, 59, 60, 62, 65, 68, 81; 27, 3 enisa, 3, 27, 29, 32, 42, 53, 59, 60, 66, 69, 76, 84, 86; 27, 5 admovet, 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 24, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 42, 51, 68, 69, 77; 28, 8 ungulas evaderet, 32, 61; 28, 10 vacua calce, 5, 7, 9, 14-17, 20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 32, 42, 51, 53, 54, 59, 60-62-66, 73, 86; 28, 12 agat, 1, 4, 5, 7, 15, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 42, 51, 53, 54, 59, 61, 63, 68; 30, 8 quod geminata, 4, 29, 32, 53, 59, 60, 62, 65, 76; 30, 15 demens, all but 16; 31, 5 torva vastum, 32; 32, 3 frustraue ... dispositis, 13, 14, 15, 17, 32, 34, 51, 59, 60, 63, 65, 76, 81; 32, 9-10 Tunc quoque congressum maioraue viribus ausum Fas superos animis conciliare tuis, 9, 22, 26, 27, 29, 53, 59, 62, 65, 76, 86; 34, 3 Confectus, Canegieter says, "Errant C.1, 2, Col.1, 2, B, L, M, Voss.2" but gives no readings for these manuscripts, another evidence of carelessness; 34, 5 ereptos, 4, 5, 7, 9-18, 20-22, 24-26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 38, 53, 54, 56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 68, 69, 73, 76, 77, 81; 34, 8 rigido, 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 16, 20, 22, 24, 26-32, 53, 59, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 76, 77, 81, 86; 34, 11 decolor, 4, 9, 26, 32, 41, 53, 59-62, 65, 73, 76, 86; 34, 12 qui quondam, 32, 59; 34, 12 saltant, 32; 35, 2 dividat, 7, 9, 13-17, 22, 26-29, 32, 34, 41, 51, 53, 59, 60, 63, 65, 66, 73, 76; 35, 3 educit, 4, 7, 11,

13, 16, 18, 25, 29, 32, 35, 53, 54, 56, 59, 60, 63, 66, 68, 86;
 35, 10 remisit, 4, 7, 10, 12, 14-16, 21, 24-28, 32, 34, 41, 54,
 69, 61, 65, 69, 73, 77; 37, 9 pererres, 32, 59; 38, 2 abibat 32;
 39, 5 sors adfuit, 22, 29, 32, 41, 59, 60, 61, 81, 86; 40, 3 sed
 quia, 4, 8, 9, 15, 19, 20, 22, 27, 29, 32, 34, 35, 41, 53, 59, 62,
 65, 66, 73, 76, 77, 81, 86; 42, 5 impiger, 3, 9, 11, 12, 13, 20,
 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 34, 51, 53, 60, 62, 65, 66, 68, 69, 76, 77,
 79, 81, 86; 42, 11 exime, 4, 9, 20-22, 26, 27, 32, 51, 53, 56, 59,
 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 76, 77, 79. In addition there are four cita-
 tions with which none of the manuscripts agree i.e., Praef. 18
 Phaedris; 15, 6 faciam; 24, 1 protectum; 35, 12 invento.

In this comparison 32 (i.e. Paris, 13026) shows remarkable agreement with the citations of M. Out of a total of seventy-three citations, four agree with no known manuscript and of the other eleven which do not agree with 32, seven do agree with either 42 or 59 which belong to the same family. There is a remote possibility that M may be identical with this manuscript for it is noticeable that it is merely a conjecture of Burmann that this is a Medicean manuscript, as Heinze, the collator evidently made no statement about its history or location. It might possibly be that this is merely another collation of the manuscript which was also collated under the name "Langermanni" (which has been proved to be identical with Paris, 13026). It might have been a collation prepared by some other person for Heinze's use, or prepared by Heinze himself at another time. If it was the collation of a wholly different manuscript, it seems very strange that Heinze should have made no note of that fact.

On the whole, however, it seems more reasonable not to

assume identity since "Langermanni" and "M" both appear in the collations of Heinze, but to conclude that it is a very old manuscript belonging to the same general class as 32, 42 and 59 and that it is more closely related to 32 (Paris, 13026) than any other manuscript. [In a footnote on page 123 column 2 Cannegieter states that ^{Mis one} of two old manuscripts ~~M is the older~~ (at vero vetusti Codices duo, quorum alter est M ultimum hoc distichon omittunt); it is unfortunate that Cannegieter does not state which was the other old manuscript.]

Voss.4.

In his preface Cannegieter states that he owes the collations of Voss.4 to Abraham Gronov who is said to have taken the readings of this manuscript while it was in the Library at Leyden. Cannegieter adds that no trace of the existence of this manuscript was to be found in the catalogues of the Leyden Library (Vossianum quartum debemus C. Abrahamo Gronovio, similiter, ut audio, ex Leydensi Bibliotheca descriptum, tametsi nullum eius vestigium hodie, nisi indices fallunt, in illius Bibliothecae Catalogo, quem nominavit, extant). Cannegieter notes further that it is in many respects similar to Voss.3 (In plurimis hic similis est Vossiano tertio). Since there is no manuscript known to-day as a Vossianus, excepting the three which have been already identified as Voss.1, 2, 3, the identity of Voss.4 cannot be pointed out, as in the case of the other three, by correspondence of history and location.

For the first twenty-two fables a record was made of all the manuscripts in Dr. Oldfather's list with which each citation of Voss.4 agreed, but so far were the results of this comparison from pointing to any manuscript as identical with this one, or

even very similar to it, that it seemed of no practical use to record the agreements of the various manuscripts with each citation. The following are the readings which Cannegieter quotes for Voss.4: Praef. 15 poemate; 23 sollicitudinem; 1, 2 rapido; 1, 8 conjunx; 1, 9 defers; 2, 2 custituisset; 2, 6 deficeretque; 2, 12 hoc licuisse; 3, 8 prono; 4, 8 depulit; 4, 10 quo; 7, 11 praemia; 7, 12 dispiciebat; 7, 14 adgreditur; 8, 10 abiectum; 8, 11 irridens; 9, 19 quodnam; 10, 2 nitido; 10, 11 quod mirum; 11, 12 discutiendus; 13, 3 repetit; 13, 7 fugit; 14, 12 genitrix; 14, 13 movet; 15, 10 tantum; 15, 15 despice, the only instance in the first twenty-two fables where this manuscript is quoted as possessing an epimythium, yet just previous to this citation is the suspicious statement that Voss.4 has no epimythium to this fable; 16, 5 ast; 16, 11 respondens; 17, 7 vulnera; 18, 4 ovans; 18, 15 tum; 20, 5 supplex lacrimis; 20, 12 redibo; 20, 16 futura; 21, 11 dominum curvas; 21, 13 tunc ait; 22, 3 pascebat poscebat; 22, 7 praestandi; 22, 6 quae speraverit; 22, 19 qui. Although Cannegieter asserts that there is close resemblance between Voss.4 and Voss.3 (= 61) there are only the four following significant cases of agreement: Praef. 15 poemate; 23 sollicitudinem; 15, 10 tantum; 22, 3 pascebat poscebat. Yet since out of forty citations only nineteen agree with Voss.3 (= 61), no weight can be attached to Cannegieter's ill supported statement.

In the citations listed above four do not agree with any known manuscript, namely, 2, 2 custituisset; 5, 17 falles; 13, 7 fugit; 14, 13 movet. Two manuscripts of Avianus at present in the Library at Leyden, namely, Lipsianus 36 and Lipsianus 51 (not yet collated completely) were examined with particular attention lest

one of them might by mere chance be identical with Voss.4, but neither of them had any of the four readings which differed from all other manuscripts. Out of a total of forty citations of Voss.4 in the first twenty-two fables, nineteen agree with Lips. 51 and twenty-three agree with Lips. 36, but the disagreements are so numerous and significant that it would be impossible to infer that either of them was that manuscript which Cannegieter quoted as Voss.4

Since time was lacking to complete a detailed study of the entire forty-two fables for this manuscript, it is possible only to draw a tentative and very general conclusion as to ^{its} ~~the~~ identity ~~of this manuscript~~. As it has the Preface and practically no epimythia it must be an old manuscript belonging to a period somewhere between the ninth and the thirteenth centuries. By elimination of those manuscripts of this period already proved identical with other manuscripts which Cannegieter used, there are left only 4, 9, 20, 22, 26, 42, 53, 62 and 73, which could be identical with Voss.4, and no one of these seems at all similar in the first twenty-two fables.

FINDING LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS ACCORDING TO DR. OLDFATHER'S LIST.

- ✓ 1 Austria, Krakau, Universitäts Bibliothek, 2233, S. XV, chart.
- ✓ 2 " Prag, " " 545, S. XIV, chart.
- ✓ 3 " " " " 546, S. XIV, XV, chart.
- ✓ 4 " " " " 1625, S. XII, membr.
- ✓ 5 " Vienna, Kaiserl. Bibliothek 303, S. XIV, membr.
- ✓ 6 " " " " CCCVI (3261) S. XVI, chart
- ✓ 7 Belgium, Brussels, Bibl. Roy, 11193, S. XIV, membr.
- ✓ 8^{5A} Austria, Vienna, Kaiserl. Bibl. 901 S. XIII, membr.
- ✓ 9 England, Cambridge, Trinity College Gale O.357 S. XII, membr.
- ✓ 10 " " Peterhouse (4)2.10 S. XIII, XIV, membr.
- ✓ 11 " " " (25) 2.18 S. XIII, XIV, membr.
- ✓ 12^{1A} Austria, Krakau, Universitäts Bibliothek, 2195 S. XIV, chart.
- ✓ 13 England Lincoln, Chapter Library C. 5.8, S. XIII, membr.
- ✓ 14 " London, Brit. Mus. Lib. Add. 10090 S. XIV, membr.
- ✓ 15 " " " " " 21, 213 S. XIII, membr.
- ✓ 16 " " " " " Reg. 15 A. VII, S. XIV, membr
- ✓ 17 " " " " " 15 A. XXXI, S. XIII, membr.
- 18 England, London, Brit. Mus. Lib. Harl. 4967, S. XIV (S. XIII) membr.
- ✓ 19 " , London, Grenville Libr. XIII (now Brit. Ms. Add. 33781) S. XIV, membr.
- 20 " , Oxford, Bodleian Libr. Auct. F 2.14 S. XI, membr.
- 21 " " " " " F 5.6, S. XIV, membr.
- ✓ 22 " " " " B.H. Rawl. G. 111, S. XI, XII, membr

- 23 England, Oxford, Bodleian Libr. Rawl. 552,C S. XIII, membr.
- 24 " Winchester Cathedral Libr. III A, S. XV, chart.
- 25 France, Besançon, Bibl. Publ. 534, S. XIII membr.
- 26 " Dijon, " " (Abb. Citeaux) 497 S. XIII, membr.
- 27 " Paris, " Nat. 5570, S. IX, X, XI, membr.
- 28 " " " " 8048, S. XIII, membr.
- 29 " " " " 8093, S. IX, membr.
- 30 " " " " 8302, S. XIV, membr.
- 31 " " " " (Cod. Lunenis) 9636, S. XV, chart.
- 32 " " " " (St. Germ.) 13026, S. IX, membr.
- 33 " " " " (San. Vict.) 15155, S. XIII membr.
- 34 " " " " " " 15160, S. XV chart.
- 35 " " " " " " 1594, (fonds franç.),
S. XIV membr.
- 36 Germany, Berlin, K. K. Bibl. 193, S. XIII, membr.
- ¹⁵⁶
~~37~~ " Donaueschingen, Fürstenbergische Bibl. 27, A.D. 1448
membr.
- 38 Germany, Erfurt, Amplonianische Bibl. Quart. 21, S. XIV m. ex.
- ¹⁵⁰
~~39~~ " Erlangen Univ. Bibl. 873.
- 40 " " " " 849, S. XV, chart.
- 41 " Karlsruhe, Hofbibliothek, 339 (85 olim), S. IX, X
membr.
- 42 Germany, Karlsruhe, Hofbibliothek (Augiensis-Reichemau) LXXIII
S. X
- 43 Germany, Karlsruhe, Hofbibliothek (Ettinheimmünster) 40, A.D.
1506, chart.
- 44 Germany, München, Hof- und Staatsbibl. 237, A.D. 1460, chart.
- 45 " " " " 391, S. XIV, membr.

Hof- und Stadt Bibl.

- 46 Germany, München, Hofstadtbibl., 609 S. XV, chart.
- 47 " " " (Augustanae S. Crucis) 4146
S. XV (1436) chart.
- 48 Germany, München, Hofstadtbibl., (Em. G. 87) 14703, S. XV
(1467), chart.
- 49 Germany, München, Hofstadtbibl., (Windberg 204) 22404, S.
XV, chart.
- 161
~~50~~ Germany, München, Hofstadtbibl., 26781, A.D. 1441, chart.
- 51A " Pommersfelden, Gräfl. Schonborn'sche Bibl. 2671, S.
XIV, membr.
- 52 Germany, Stuttgart, Königl. Landesbibliothek 34, S. XIV
- 53 " Trier, Stadt Bibl. 1093, S. IX, X.
- 54 " Wolfenbüttel, Herzogl. Bibl. 1310 Aug. S. XIII, membr.
- 55 " " " " 3734 " S. XV, membr.
- 56 " " " " 87.5 " S. XIII, membr.
- 57 " " " " 288 Gud. S. XIV, membr.
- 58 " " " " 1854 Helmst. S. XV, chart.
- 59 Holland, Leiden, Univ. Bibl., Voss. L. Q. 86 S. IX, membr.
- 60 " " " " (Abb. St. Mart.) Voss. L. O.
15, S. X, XI membr.
- 61 Holland, Leiden, Univ. Bibl., Voss. L. O. 89, S. XII, membr.
- 62 Italy, Florence, Laurentian Libr. (Bib. Med.-Laur.) Plut.
LXVIII, 24, S. XI, membr.
- 63 Italy, Florence, Laurentian Libr. Ash. 1813, S. IX, XI,
membr.
- 64 Italy, Florence. Bibl. Riccardienne 574, S. XIV, membr.
- 65 " Naples, R. Bibl. Nazionale (Cod. Perrot. Seg. 4)
S. XV, chart.

- 66 Italy, Reggio-Emilia, Bibl. Municip. C. VIII. C. 10, S. XIII, XIV, membr.
- 67 Italy, Sandavieles del Friuli, Bibl. Comm. 97, S. XIV
- 68 " Rome, Bibl. Apost. Vat. 1663, S. XII, XIII, membr.
- 69 " " " " " Ottob. 1297, S. XIII, membr.
- 70 " " " " " " 3025, S. XV, chart.
- 71 " " " " " Palat. 242, S. XII, membr.
- 72 " " " " " " 1573, S. XIII, membr.
- 73 " " " " " Reg. 1424, S. IX, XI, membr.
- 74 " " " " " " 1556, S. XIII, membr.
- 75 " " " " " " 2080, S. XIII, membr.
- 76 " " " " " Urb. 368, paulo ante 1517 A.D. membr.

Vellum.

- 77 Switzerland, Basel, Öffentl. Bibl. A. N. II, 42, S. XV, chart.
- 78 Switzerland, Bern, Stadt. u. Hochschul.-Bibl., 688, S. XIII membr.
- 79 Switzerland, St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 1396, S. XI, XII, membr.
- 80 Denmark, Cod. Vetustiss. of Johannes Cabeljau, S. IX (or earlier).
- 81 Holland, Cod. Campensis, only ms. of Nodel, 1787, A.D. 1339 membr.
- 82 Germany, Cod. Palatinus, only ms. of Nevelet, 1610.

EARLY EDITIONS.

- 83 K. Lachman, Berlin, 1845
- 84 E. Baehrens, P. L. M. V., Leipzig, 1883.
- 85 R. Ellis, Oxford, 1887.
- 86 H. Cannegieter, Amsterdam, 1731.





UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 079095516